Copyright

by

Jiayong Le

2004

The Dissertation Committee for Jiayong Le
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Affective Characteristics of American Students Studying Chinese in China: A Study of Heritage and Non-Heritage Learners' Beliefs and Foreign Language Anxiety

Committee:

_____
Elaine K Horwitz, Supervisor

_____
Diane Schallert

_____
Zena Moore

_____
Leslie Jarmon

_____
Gordon Bennett

Affective Characteristics of American Students Studying Chinese in China: A Study of Heritage and Non-Heritage Learners' Beliefs and Foreign Language Anxiety

by

Jiayong Le, BA., MEd.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

December, 2004

Acknowledgments

My deepest respect and gratitude goes to Dr. Elaine Horwitz, my advisor and chairperson, for guiding me through each step of my graduate study and dissertation process. From her I gained knowledge beyond pure academics; she taught me professionalism through her devotion and persistence in her work. Without her generous help, I would not have successfully completed my dissertation.

My thanks also go to Diane Schallert, Dr. Zena Moore, Dr. Leslie Jarmon and Dr. Gordon Bennett for serving on my dissertation committee and providing helpful advice. I have benefited greatly from their teaching and guidance. I would like to extend my special thanks to Dr. Jeannette Faurot for serving on my qualifying examination committee and advising me with intellectual inspiration and constructive suggestions.

I owe many thanks to Dr. Thomas Bohman for his consistent assistance and detailed advice in statistical analysis. I also wish to thank Kathy Sowash for her encouraging words and thoughtful help throughout my graduate study.

I would like to thank all the professors and administrators who assisted me in administering the survey and research participants who were involved in this study. Their help made this dissertation possible in the first place. I would also like to thank all my friends and faculty who kept faith in me.

Last but not least, I am grateful to my family for their support. I am deeply indebted to my wife for her understanding, encouragement and help during my study. I dedicate my Ph.D. dissertation to them.

Affective Characteristics of American Students Studying Chinese in China: A Study of Heritage and Non-Heritage Learners' Beliefs and Foreign Language Anxiety

Publication No._____

Jiayong Le, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2004

Supervisor: Elaine K.. Horwitz

The purpose of this study was to investigate the affective characteristics of American college students studying Chinese in China, including their reasons for learning Chinese and studying abroad, their beliefs about language learning and their foreign language anxiety. The students were divided into 3 groups based on their ethnic heritage. The influence of their ethnic languages and cultures and other related background factors on three ethnic groups' reason, beliefs and anxiety were explored through quantitative analyses and cross-comparison analyses. The results of this study were also compared with the results with previous studies using the BALLI and the FLCAS.

A total of 133 American students (4.52% of the target population) enrolled in Chinese programs in seven key universities in China participated in this study. Three survey instruments were used -- the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI), the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) and a detailed Individual Background Information Questionnaire. The BALLI Plus explored the specific learning context of studying Chinese in China.

Several conclusions were made based on the findings of this study. First, the present study identified some unique and important characteristics of American college students studying Chinese in China and provided an overall profile of them. Significant demographic differences among the three ethnic groups were found in a variety of areas.

Second, this study has found some important differences among the three ethnic groups in their reasons for learning Chinese and studying abroad, their beliefs about language learning and their foreign language anxiety. The different ethnic language and cultural backgrounds likely played an important role in these differences.

Third, the findings of this study showed that American students studying Chinese in China were highly motivated but also highly anxious foreign language learners. A substantial majority of them had a long history of foreign language learning, enjoyed learning languages, and believed that they would ultimately learn to speak Chinese very well. However, they also have the highest levels of foreign language anxiety found in studies using the FLCAS.

The findings of the present study provide new insights on the backgrounds, language learning beliefs and foreign language anxiety of students studying a less commonly taught foreign language. The findings of the role of ethnic language and culture backgrounds in this study provide a new theoretical explanation for some of the affective differences that have been found among foreign language learners.

Table of Contents

List of Tables……..……..….xiv

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION ……1

Statement of the Problem ……...2

Research Questions ……8

Significance of the Study ……9

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW ……11

Learner Beliefs About Foreign Language Learning …….……...11

Research On Beliefs About Foreign Language Learning …….13

Beliefs, Motivation and Anxiety ……..……19

Beliefs and Motivation ……...19

Beliefs and Anxiety ……24

Research on Foreign Language Anxiety .…… …. ……28

Types of Anxiety ……..28

Trait, State Anxiety and Situation Anxiety……....29

Facilitating and Debilitating Anxiety …….……...30

Foreign Language Anxiety ……31

Early Studies ……..31

Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety ……32

Effects of Foreign Language Anxiety …….32

Potential Sources of Foreign Language Anxiety ……..36

CHAPTER 3: OVERVIEW OF STUDY ABROAD AND TEACHING CHINESE AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE…….…….40

Development of Study Abroad in the U.S……...……..42

History and Development of Learning Chinese in the U.S. ……. 43

Special Characteristics of Learning and

Teaching Chinese in the U.S. ……...45
1. Unique Tonal and Writing System ……45
2. Diversity of Student Population…….46
3. Variety of Textbook and Language Emphasis……48
4. Overemphasis of Reading …….49
Foreign Language Instruction in China ……... 50
Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language in China ……..…...…….....52

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY ……..59
Participants ……..……..…59
Instruments…….……60
Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI)
and BALLI Plus ……...60
Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) ……...62
Individual Background Information Questionnaire……...63
Data Collection ……..……..63
DataAnalysis ……..……..…….64
Quantitative Analysis ……...……..……...64
Additional Analyses ……...……..…….65

CHAPTER 5: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION ……...67
Descriptive Statistics and Analysis of the Background Variables ……67
Age, Gender and Educational Background …….67
Chinese Language Learning Experience ……..69
Other Foreign Language Learning Experience ……71
Goals and Self-Perspectives on Language Learning
And Chinese proficiency ……72
Reasons for Learning Chinese and Studying Chinese in China …..……..74
Reasons for Learning Chinese …….74

Reasons for Studying Chinese in China……78
Analysis of Variance of Three Ethnic Groups ……80
ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Age, Gender,
Native Language and Educational level and Major …… 81
ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Chinese Language
Learning Experience ……..……..83
ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Other Foreign
Language Learning Experience ……..……..……..85
ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Goals for Learning Chinese
Enjoyment of Chinese Learning and Self-Perspectives on
Chinese Proficiency ……87
Descriptive Analysis of the BALLI …….. ...……..…… 89
The Difficulty of Language Learning. ……..……...…..89
Foreign Language Aptitude…… ……94
The Nature of Language Learning ……...97
Learning and Communication Strategies ……....101
Motivation and Expectation ……..105
Descriptive Analysis of the BALLI Plus ……109
Perspectives on Learning Chinese ……..109
Views and Evaluations about Learning Chinese in China ……..114
Descriptive Analysis of FLCAS ……119
The FLCAS Scores of the Three Ethnic Groups ……...119
The FLCAS Scores of Subgroups by Ages,
Gender and Educational Background ……...…….121
The FLCAS Scores of Subgroups by Chinese
Language Learning Experience ……123
The FLCAS Scores of Subgroups by Other
Foreign Language Learning Experience ……124
The FLCAS Scores of Subgroups by Goals for

Learning Chinese and Enjoyment of Chinese Learning …….126
The FLCAS Scores of Subgroups by Self-Perspectives
on Language Learning and Chinese Proficiency ……..……126
Factor Analysis of the BALLI ……..129
Factor Analysis of the BALLI as A Whole Group ……130
Factor 1: Motivation and Aptitude in
Learning Foreign Language ……..130
Factor 2: The Nature and Characteristics of
Learning Chinese ……..132
Factor 3: Self-efficacy and Strategies used in
Learning Spoken Chinese ……..……133
Factor 4: Perspectives on Foreign Language Learners…….....134
Factor 5: The Difficulty of Chinese and
Strategies for Learning Chinese ……...……..135
Comparison with Other Studies ……. 136
Three Factor Analyses of the FLCAS …….....139
Anxiety Factors ……..140
FLCAS Factor 1 ……141
FLCAS Factor 2 ……145
FLCAS Factor 3 ……147
FLACS Factor 4 ……149
FLACS Factor 5 ……151
FLACS Factor 6 ……153
Discussion of the Similarity and Difference
of the FLACS Factors ……..…..154

CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION……..159
Summary of Findings……159
Conclusions…….... 171

Implications……..……..193
Limitations……..……..….180
Recommendations for Further Research……...…….185

APPENDICES……...189
Appendix A: Consent Form……...190
Appendix B: Background Questionaire…..…….191
Appendix C: Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory……...194
Appendix D: BALLI PLUS……....197
Appendix E: Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale……...199
Appendix F: Changes in the BALLI and the FLCAS……..202

Bibliography……205
Vita…….229

List of Tables

Table 5.1 Reasons for Learning Chinese (1)……....…… ……..….75
Table 5.2 Reasons for Learning Chinese (2)……..……..…….75
Table 5.3 Orders of the Five Most Important Factors among the three groups for Learning Chinese……77
Table 5.4 Reasons for Studying Chinese in China (1) ……..…… ...78
Table 5.5 Reasons for Studying Chinese in China (2) ……..……....79
Table 5.6 ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Age, Gender, Native Language, Educational and Major……...….……..…81
Table 5.7 Post-hoc Multiple Comparisons of Ethnic Groups by Age, Gender, Native Language, Educational level and Major……..82
Table 5.8 ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Chinese Language Learning Experience ……..83
Table 5.9 Post-hoc Multiple Comparisons of Ethnic Groups by Chinese Language Learning Experience…….84
Table 5.10 ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Other Foreign Language Learning Experience……...…..85
Table 5.11 Post-hoc Multiple Comparisons of Ethnic Groups by Other Foreign Language Learning Experience …..…….....86
Table 5.12 ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Goals for Learning Chinese, Enjoyment of Chinese Learning and Self-Perspectives on Chinese Proficiency……..……...87
Table 5.13 Post-hoc Multiple Comparison of Ethnic Groups by Goals of Learning Chinese, Enjoyment of Chinese Learning and Self-Perspectives on Chinese Proficiency……...88
Table 5.14 The Difficulty of Language Learning ……..……...90
Table 5.15 Foreign Language Aptitude……..……..94
Table 5.16 The Nature of Language Learning ……....98

Table 5.17 Learning and Communication Strategies……..……..…102
Table 5.18 Motivation and Expectations……..……..106
Table 5.19 Perspectives on Learning Chinese……..…...110
Table 5.20 Views and Evaluation of Learning Chinese in China…….....115
Table 5.21 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by Ethnic Group…….....119
Table 5.22 ANOVA of FLCAS Scores by Ethnic Groups……120
Table 5.23 Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons of FLCAS
Scores by Ethnic Groups…….120
Table 5.24 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by Age and Gender…….122
Table 5.25 T-test of FLCAS Scores by Gender……..…122
Table 5.26 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by
Educational Levels and Majors…….....123
Table 5.27 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by
Chinese Language Learning Experience……..…..124
Table 5.28 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by
Other Foreign Language Learning Experience……..…..…..125
Table 5.29 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by Goals for
Learning Chinese and Enjoyment of Chinese Learning....…….....126
Table 5.30 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by
Self-Perspectives on Chinese Proficiency……..…....128
Table 5.31 ANOVA of FLCAS Scores by
Self-Perspectives on Chinese Proficiency……..……128
Table 5.32 Post-Hoc Multiple Comparisons of FLCAS Scores
by Self- Perspectives on…….129
Table 5.33 Factor 1: Motivation and Aptitude in
Learning Foreign Language……...……...…….....131
Table 5.34 Factor 2: The Nature and Characteristics of Learning Chinese……133
Table 5.35 Factor 3: Self-efficacy and Strategies used in
Learning Spoken Chinese……...…134

Table 5.36 Factor 4: Perspectives on Foreign Language Learners…….....135
Table 5.37 Factor 5: The Difficulty of Chinese and Strategies
for Learning Chinese ……..….135
Table 5.38 FLCAS Factor 1
(a) Group A's Factor 1……..…….....…...….142
(b) Group B's Factor 1……..……...143
(c) Group C's Factor 1……...144
Table 5.39 FLCAS Factor 2
(a) Group A's Factor 2……..…….....…...….145
(b) Group B's Factor 2……..……...146
(c) Group C's Factor 2……...147
Table 5.40 FLCAS Factor 3
(a) Group A's Factor 3……..…….....…...….148
(b) Group B's Factor 3……..……...148
(c) Group C's Factor 3……...149
Table 5.41 FLCAS Factor 4
(a) Group A's Factor 4……..…….....…...….150
(b) Group B's Factor 4……..……...150
(C) Group C's Factor 4……....……...…...151
Table 5.42 FLCAS Factor 5
(a) Group A's Factor 5……..…….....…...….142
(b) Group B's Factor 5……..……...143
(c) Group C's Factor 5……...144
Table 5.43 FLCAS Factor 6
(a) Group A's Factor 6……..…….....…...….142
(b) Group B's Factor 6……..……...143
(c) Group C's Factor 6…….....144

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Two important trends have appeared in foreign language education resulting from the intense political and economic changes in the world since the late 1980s. One is the rapid rise in the number of American students enrolled in foreign language programs, especially in the less commonly taught foreign languages such as Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese. Enrollments in foreign languages in higher education increased by more than four times between 1960 and 2002 and by 12.95% from 1990 to 2002 (Welles, 2003). From 1990 to 2002, total enrollments in Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese increased by 205%, 75% and 14% respectively. However, among the commonly taught foreign languages in the US, except for Spanish, with total enrollments rising 40% from 1990 to 2002, French and German lost 26% and 32% respectively (Welles, 2003). The second trend is that the number of American students studying foreign languages in non-Western European countries has increased rapidly. "Since 1991/1992, the number of students studying abroad has more than doubled" (IIE, 2003). "60.12% of American students still chose Western European countries to study in 1998/1999, however, the share of American students studying in western Europe has fallen by 18% since 1985/1986" (IIE, 2001). Despite economic and security concerns post-Sept 11, "campus professionals have reported increased interest in study abroad in each of the years following 9/11" (IIE, 2003). "Many countries, particularly in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, saw large increases in the number of American students they hosted in 2001/02" (IIE, 2003). The number of American students studying in China and Japan increased the most (33% and 21% respectively) between 2000/01 and 2001/02 among the countries where American students study the less commonly taught foreign languages (IIE,

2003). Since 1991/1992, the number of American students studying in China has increased more than five times (IIE, 2003).

Although both the number of American students enrolled in Chinese in the U.S. and the number of American students enrolled in study abroad programs in China have increased dramatically, the total numbers of both types of Chinese study are still very small compared with the number of students studying the commonly taught foreign languages. Chinese is the sixth most commonly taught foreign language in U.S. institutions of higher education. However, the number of American students enrolled in Chinese constitutes only 2.4 % of the total number of students enrolled in foreign languages in 2002 (Welles, 2003). Only 2.4% of American students studying abroad went to study in China in 2001/2002 (IIE, 2003). Students of the less commonly taught foreign languages such as Chinese and Japanese also have high drop-out rates likely due to the difficulty level of the these languages (Mill et al., 1987; Samimy & Tabuse, 1992; Norman, 1996; Pease, 1996; Oh, 1996). According to the studies of the Foreign Service Institute and the Defense Language Institute, in order to develop the same level of speaking proficiency in Spanish, German or French, "it would take almost three times as long for students of Chinese or Japanese to reach a comparable degree of language mastery" (McGinnis, 1994, p.18). Based on experiences at a summer institute sponsored by The Task Force for Teacher Training in the Less Commonly Taught Foreign Language in 1991, McGinnis (1994) summarized five essentials in the learning of less commonly taught foreign languages: lifelong language-learning; having a goal of expertise; learning and teaching based on culture; learner responsibility; and sensitivity and response to local conditions.

Statement of the Problem

During the last two decades, most studies involving American students studying Chinese have focused on teachers, teaching, and testing (Hayes, 1988;

Christensen & Wu, 1993; Hannas 1995; Myers, 1997; Wang, 1995; Su, 1998; Linnell, 2001), instructional methods (Everson, 1986; Shen, 1989; Parkard, 1989; Miracle, 1989; Chu, 1990; Yuan, 1995; Li, 1996; He, 1999), teaching materials (Everson, 1986, 1988; Wang, 1989; Parkard, 1990), character learning (Liu, 1983; Hayes, 1988, 1990; Everson, 1988; 1992; Parkard, 1990; Liu, 1992; Polio, 1994; Wen, 1995; Chen, 1996) and error analysis (Sergent, 1990; Chen, 1984; Zhao, 1989; Jen, 1997). Affective factors such as motivation, beliefs, and anxiety have been almost completely ignored despite the growing body of evidence to indicate that foreign language learners are highly influenced by affective factors (Gardner, 1985, 1992; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1987; Horwitz et al., 1986; Horwitz, 1988, 1989, 1999, 2001).

In the past two decades, an increasing number of researchers have realized the important influence of language beliefs in foreign language learning process. Several studies have focused on language learning beliefs and tried to explore, describe or explain the role of beliefs in second language learning. (Wenden, 1986a, 1986b; 1987, 1991; Abraham & Vann, 1987; Horwitz, 1985, 1987, 1988, 1999; Cotterall, 1995, 1999; Riley, 1997; Sakui & Gaies, 1999). Horwitz (1987, 1988) was the first to systematically identify learners' beliefs about language learning. She wrote, " In 1987 and 1988, I argued that it was important to understand learner beliefs about language learning in order to understand learner approaches to and satisfactions with language instruction and offered an instrument, the Beliefs About Language learning Inventory (BALLI) to collect these beliefs systematically" (Horwitz, 1999, p.557). The BALLI was developed based on the results of free recall activities and group discussions with both foreign language and ESL learners and teachers. The BALLI has become a popular instrument for investigating beliefs about language learning. Although the BALLI and its modified or enlarged versions have been used in eliciting learners' beliefs about language learning in studies of foreign language learners in the U.S., ESL learners in English speaking countries and EFL learners in foreign countries,

to date there is no comparable study of a less commonly taught foreign language by learners studying in a target language country.

Learners' beliefs about language learning are a major contributor to language anxiety (Young, 1991). Many studies have indicated that irrational beliefs of various kinds are correlated with high trait and state anxiety and various anxiety disorders (Albert Ellis, 1962; Lohr & Bonge, 1981; Himle et al., 1982; Deffenbacher et al., 1986; Cramer & Fong, 1991). Horwitz (1988) and a series of studies using the BALLI (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kern, 1995; Oh, 1996; and Kunt, 1997) found that the students had many unrealistic beliefs about various aspects of foreign language learning, such as the difficulty of language learning and language aptitude. These unrealistic beliefs might be an important source of foreign language anxiety. For example, the students in these studies substantially underestimated the time needed for learning a foreign language. This over-optimism about foreign language learning could easily cause frustration and anxiety (Young, 1991; Horwitz, 1999).

Findings from studies investigating the effects of anxiety indicate that foreign language anxiety is fairly common among language learners (Young, 1991). Gardner et al (1987) revealed that significantly higher levels of language anxiety and significantly lower self-evaluations of language learning competence could make some students become drop-outs, though their levels of foreign language achievement were not significantly different from those of continuing students. According to Krashen (1985), a high affective filter including a high level of anxiety would increase the difficulty of second language acquisition.

Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope defined foreign language anxiety as "a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process" (Horwitz, et al., 1986, p.128) and were the first to propose a situation-specific anxiety in response to language learning. The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), an instrument developed by them, was the

first anxiety measure to treat general foreign language anxiety as a separate and distinct phenomenon particular to language leaning. The FLCAS is "a self-report measure which assesses the degree of anxiety, as evidenced by negative performance expectancies and social comparisons, psycho-physiological symptoms, and avoidance behaviors" (Horwitz et al., 1986, p.559). Although there have been an increased number of studies about foreign language anxiety in recent years, almost all of them have focused on commonly taught foreign language learners and ESL learners in the U.S. and EFL learners in other countries (Rodriguez, 1995; Truitt, 1997; Kunt, 1997; Kim, 1998; Yan, 1998; Owuegbuzie et al., 1999; Bailey et al., 1999; Spitalli, 2000; Coulombe, 2000). Foreign language anxiety in learners of less commonly taught foreign languages, especially in target language environments has received little attention.

Gardner et al. (Gardner et al., 1983; Gardner, 1985, 1988; Gardner et al., 1999) proposed a Socio-Educational Model of Second Language Acquisition to explore the important role of the socio-cultural milieu in second language learning process. Gardner et al. (1999) indicated: that "the sociocultural milieu plays an important role in that it can influence individuals of attitudes, motivation, and anxiety as well as the relative importance that these attributes play in the language learning process" (p.422). They also suggested, that "another factor that may be an important determinant of second language achievement is the relative presence of the second language group in the community. Research suggests that one's degree of contact with the second language group will have an influence on the extent to which a second language is learned". However, "in monolingual communities, other contextual aspects such as the second language learning situation and parental encouragement may play a larger role in the student's motivation and achievement" (p.423). Gardner et al. (1983) viewed motivation to be a cause of language anxiety such as high levels of motivation result in low levels of anxiety and late, Gardner and MacIntyre (Gardner and

MacIntyre, 1993, Gardner et al., 1999) viewed motivation as both a cause and an effective of anxiety.

According to Gardner et al.'s Socio-Educational Model, compared with learners of commonly taught foreign language in the U.S and abroad, ESL learners and learners of less commonly taught foreign language in the U.S. and EFL learners in other countries, American students studying Chinese in China as a group might have some important differences in motivation, beliefs about language learning, and anxiety resulting from the unique socio-cultural context of studying a less commonly taught foreign language in a target language environment.

Based on Gardner et al.'s Socio-Educational Model, it is also possible that American students studying Chinese in China with different ethnic backgrounds are essentially in a different socio-cultural context, because of the influence of their ethnic languages and cultures. These varying socio-cultural contexts might influence the students' orientations towards and reactions to studying Chinese abroad.

Generally speaking, Chinese is more difficult for English speakers to learn than commonly taught foreign languages (McGinnis, 1994; Pease, 1996). However, Chinese would seem to be easier to learn for most students with Asian backgrounds, especially those with Chinese backgrounds, because of the similarity of their ethnic languages and cultures. In addition, false beginners (students who have a high level of Chinese but pretend to be beginning learners for easy grades) and the high drop-out rate among students without Asian backgrounds are two particular phenomena in Chinese classes (Christensen & Wu, 1993; Norman, 1996; Pease, 1996; Wen, 1997).

Because of the differences between the English language and American culture and the less commonly taught foreign languages and cultures, learning a less commonly taught foreign language would seem to be different from learning commonly taught foreign languages. In addition, studying abroad, in a less

commonly taught foreign language and culture context, is not only different from studying the same foreign language at home but also different from studying abroad in a commonly taught foreign language and culture context. Several studies have indicated that American students studying Chinese in China and studying Japanese in Japan have experienced high levels of cultural conflicts and foreign language anxiety because of difference social societies, education systems, teaching methods, values and customs (Xu, 1985; Bi, 1985, 1989; Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Penner, 1995; Mizuno, 1998; Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000).

Because of different socio-cultural contexts, studies of learners of less commonly taught languages require theories especially related to learning less commonly taught foreign languages in a target language context. Chinese culture strongly influences China's education system, teaching philosophy and teaching methods. On the one hand, the Chinese language teachers who teach American students in China have strong knowledge of Chinese language and culture, but very few of them know very much about English and American culture, nor do they understand American ways of learning and teaching. Many of them have never studied any foreign language or been abroad. On the other hand, almost all American students without Chinese family backgrounds start to study Chinese as adult learners. When going to study in China, they know little about Chinese culture, especially the educational system and teaching methods. Therefore, it is not uncommon for Chinese teachers to impose values from their own culture on learners especially with respect to methods of learning Chinese. American learners, however, may have difficulty adapting their learning styles to their teachers' approaches.

The introduction of socio-cultural dimensions into the study of motivation towards learning a foreign language, beliefs about language learning and foreign language anxiety research has already resulted in some important results. However, there are no studies of a less commonly taught foreign language in a target language country. There are also no studies specifically focusing on the

role of learners' ethnic languages and cultural backgrounds in learning a less commonly taught foreign language where foreign language learners' affective characteristics might conflict with the socio-cultural context. According to her study of Japanese students studying English in Japan, LoCastro (1994, 1995) questioned Oxford's claim (1990) that the learning strategies used by students in ESL program in North American university settings could apply to L2 learners with different educational and social backgrounds and called for more research on language strategies in different learning environments.

In order to motivate students with various backgrounds towards learning Chinese, especially Chinese in China, to reduce their anxiety and to improve their learning achievements, it is important to explore the role of ethnic languages and cultures in learning Chinese, students' reasons for learning Chinese in China, their beliefs about language learning, and their levels of foreign language anxiety. This research is necessary not only because Chinese is a less commonly taught foreign language in the U.S. and the Chinese language and culture are so different from English and Western culture, but also because the Chinese language is spoken by the largest population in the world. In addition, the Chinese culture has a history of more than 5,000 years and China and the U.S. are both world powers, which are strongly influenced by each other.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of American college students learning Chinese in China?

2. What kinds of reasons do American College students have for learning Chinese and for studying Chinese in China?

3. What are the language learning beliefs of American college students learning Chinese in China? How do these beliefs compare with the beliefs of other learning groups?

4. What are the views and evaluations about learning Chinese in China among the American students learning Chinese in China?

5. What factors contribute to the language learning beliefs of the American students learning Chinese in China?

6. What levels of foreign language anxiety do the American students learning Chinese in China have? Are there different levels of foreign language anxiety among the different subgroups?

7. What factors contribute to the anxiety of the American students learning Chinese in China among the three ethnic groups?

Significance of the Study

This study has important theoretical and practical implications.

Theoretically, the findings of this study might contribute to the development of existing theories about learners' motivation towards learning foreign languages, learners' beliefs about language learning and their foreign language anxiety. The findings of this study will likely be the first to provide empirical insights about American students' reasons for studying a less commonly taught foreign language abroad, their beliefs about language learning and their foreign language anxiety.

The present study will be the first to explore the affective characteristics of American students learning Chinese, based on their ethnic languages and cultural background. Previous studies either considered Chinese learners as a single group or excluded Non-Asian background students. In order to describe the affective characteristics of American students learning Chinese, it is important to explore the role of ethnic languages and cultural backgrounds in learning

Chinese. Accordingly, this study will compare three ethnic-origin groups (Non-Asian background, Asian background and Chinese background).

In addition, the language learning beliefs of American students learning Chinese in China will be compared with those of American students learning foreign languages in the U.S. and ESL learners in other countries to determine if American students learning Chinese in China have distinctive beliefs. The present study aims to present a picture of the similarities and differences of language learning beliefs among various types of second language learners.

The findings of this study might also have practical significance. Since there are few quantitative studies in foreign language education in China, this study might provide a model for other quantitative studies of language education in China. The findings of this study might help Chinese language teachers better understand the similarities and differences among learners of different ethnic backgrounds and the role of ethnic languages and cultures in learning Chinese. The information offered in this study might also help administrators of Chinese language programs as well as Chinese language teachers in the U.S. and China develop better programs to meet the needs of American students studying Chinese in the U.S. and China.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will review the research literature pertaining to the two major constructs of this study: beliefs abut foreign language learning and foreign language anxiety, including the relationship among beliefs, motivation and anxiety. The literature review regarding study abroad and Chinese language learning and teaching appears in Chapter 3: Overview of Study Abroad and Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language.

Learner Beliefs About Foreign Language Learning

Learners of all foreign languages have opinions about learning materials, instructional methods, learning situation and teachers. "Definite view points on the best techniques for learning a language, the 'right' age to begin language study, and the nature of the language learning process are the subject of airline magazine articles, Sunday supplement advertisements, and cocktail party small-talk". "Language students have probably been exposed to many common and sometimes contradictory notions about language learning" (Horwitz, 1988, p.283). As Foss and Reizel (1988) indicated, beliefs originate from cultures and families, and are also developed from life experiences. Language beliefs play an important role in foreign language learning, because they affect "learners' expectations for and commitment to" their foreign language learning (Horwitz, 1988).

Although beliefs about language learning have been studied for a long time, many researchers have recognized the difficulty of defining beliefs and language learning beliefs. Pajares (1992) regarded beliefs as a "messy" construct. He argued that the difficulty might be partly due to the paradoxical nature of

beliefs and the varying agendas of researchers. Izard and Smith (1982) argued that the paradoxical nature of beliefs stems from the verb "to believe" expressing both doubt and assurance. The term belief is used to form or judge, justify or condemn. James (1991) noted that beliefs influenced actions and actions or facts, in turn, modified beliefs. Dewey (1933) defined beliefs as a form of thought and a part of our experience. They are not considered the ideal form of thought because they are not based on evidence but on opinions, traditions and customs. As a part of our experience they are obstacles and promoters of knowledge at the same time. Dewey (1983) further explained that "Beliefs are not made by existence in a mechanical or logical or psychological sense. 'Reality' naturally instigates belief" (p.84). Dewey described beliefs as paradoxical, changing and dynamic. Pintrich et al. (1993) claimed the nature of beliefs as a paradox that existed for the learner: on the one hand, current conceptions potentially constituted momentum that resisted conceptual change; but they also provided frameworks that the learner could use to interpret and understand new potentially conflicting information.

As was the case in defining beliefs in general, defining beliefs about language learning is also difficult. Several definitions have been used to refer to beliefs about language learning including folklinguistic theories of learning (Miller & Ginsberg, 1990); learner representations (Holec, 1987); representations (Riley, 1994); learners' philosophy of language learning (Abraham & Vann, 1987); metacognitive knowledge (Wenden, 1986a, 1987); cultural beliefs (Gardner, 1988); learning culture (Riley. 1997); the culture of learning languages (Barcelos, 1995) and the culture of learning (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996). Although researchers use different terms, their definitions refer to the nature of language and language learning. Some definitions stress cultural aspects, socio-cultural milieus and the social nature of beliefs. Learners' beliefs about language learning are seen to be shaped by factors such as opinions from their parents and siblings, teachers, classmates and friends; advocates or views from national cultures, the prevalent

culture in communities, and ethnic background cultures. People's awareness of their own academic learning abilities, particularly with respect to language learning and their previous life experiences relevant to language learning also contribute to the formation of beliefs. Language learning beliefs are not only a cognitive concept, they are also social constructs born out of our experiences and problems (Gardner et al., 1983; Gardner, 1985, 1988; Gardner et al., 1999).

Research On Beliefs About Foreign Language Learning

In recent years, an increasing number of researchers have stressed the influence of language beliefs in foreign language learning. Several studies have focused on language learning beliefs and tried to explore, describe or explain the role of language learning beliefs (Wenden, 1986, 1987, 1991; Abraham & Vann, 1987; Horwitz, 1985, 1987, 1988, 1999; Cotterall, 1995, 1999; Riley, 1997; Sakui & Gaies, 1999). A series of investigations have related language learning beliefs to the use of language learning strategies (Wenden, 1987; Horwitz, 1987; Yang, 1992; Elbaum et al., 1993; Oxford, 1990; Kern, 1995), foreign language anxiety (Horwitz, 1990; Truitt, 1995; Oh, 1996; Kunt, 1997; Coulombe, 2000), teacher's beliefs about language learning or teaching (Horwitz, 1985; Nunan, 1988; MeCargar, 1993; Lutz, 1990; Kern, 1995; Samimy & Lee, 1997), and metacognitive awareness (Carrell, 1989; Van & Abraham, 1990; Victori & Lockhart, 1995; Wenden, 1991, 1998).

Existing studies on beliefs about language learning can be categorized by language learning context: (1) foreign language learners in the U.S. (a) commonly taught foreign language learners in the U.S. (Horwitz, 1988; Kern, 1995; Hurt, 1997; Rifkin, 2000) (b) less commonly taught foreign languages in the U.S. (Oh, 1996; Kuntz, 1996; Sammimy & Lee, 1997; Mori, 1999a, 1999b; Hinenoya, 2000; (2) foreign language learners in a target language country (this study); (3) learners of English as a second language in an English speaking country (Wenden, 1986,

1987; Horwitz, 1987; Cotterall, 1995; (4) learners of English as a foreign language in Japan, (Luppescu & Day, 1990; Saki & Gaies, 1999), Korea (Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kim-Yoon, 2000), China (Su, 1995; Wang, 1996), Hong Kong (Benson & Lor, 1999), Taiwan (Yang, 1992; Huang, 1997; Tsai, 2003; Wu, 2003), Russia (Tumposky, 1991; Gaies et al., 1999), North Cyprus (Kunt, 1997) and Brazil (Barcelos, 1995).

Wenden (1986a, 1987) and Horwitz (1985) are pioneers in research about language learning beliefs. Wenden interviewed 25 advanced-level adult ESL learners in New York City and divided the learners' beliefs about language learning into three categories. Category one emphasized the importance of using the language naturally and frequently. Category two stressed the necessity of formal language learning, especially grammar and vocabulary. Category three focused on the role of personal factors. Wenden found that learners' beliefs about language learning were expressed in "(1) the kinds of strategies they used; (2) what they attended to; (3) the criteria they used to evaluate the effectiveness of learning activities and social contexts which gave them the opportunity to use and practice the language; and (4) where they concentrated the use of their strategies" (1986a, p.4). In addition, Wenden (1987) found that learners' beliefs about language learning were consistent with their use of language learning strategies.

Horwitz (1983b, 1985, 1987, 1988) was the first to systematically identify learners' beliefs about language learning. She conducted free-recall activities and group discussions with both foreign language and ESL learners and teachers to identify common beliefs about language learning. Based on these results, she developed an instrument to elicit learners' beliefs about language learning, the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI). The instrument was then pilot-tested with 150 first-semester foreign language students at The University of Texas at Austin (Horwitz, 1985). The BALLI contains 34 items that are categorized into 5 categories: (1) the difficulty of foreign learning; (2) foreign language aptitude; (3) the nature of language learning; (4) learning and

communication strategies; and (5) motivation and expectations. Horwitz (1987) administered the BALLI to 32 intermediate ESL students from various cultural backgrounds enrolled in a university intensive English program. Subsequently, Horwitz (1988) used the BALLI with American students of foreign languages. Two hundred and forty-one university students of German, French and Spanish participated in this study. The responses of these foreign language learners were more diverse than those of the ESL students. The results of both studies showed that most students believed in the difficulty of learning a second or foreign language but underestimated the time needed for mastering a language. They generally had overly-optimistic and unrealistic expectations for learning achievement. This was especially true for the foreign language learners. Although many students realized the importance of communicative teaching methods, they still emphasized learning vocabulary and grammar, the repetition of tapes, and correct pronunciation from the beginning of language learning. Most of students of foreign languages did not have strong desires to know the foreign culture and did not believe that mastering a foreign language would help them to get a better job. Most of the ESL learners had a strong will to learn about American culture and believed that one could learn English better in an English-speaking country. Horwitz (1999) found that various cultural backgrounds and previous experience played an important role in learners' beliefs about language learning, particularly for ESL learners and concluded that unrealistic beliefs might be a cause for foreign language anxiety and poor language learning and performance.

Tumposky (1991) did a comparative study of language learning beliefs held by university ESL students in the U.S.S.R. and university students of Spanish and French in the U.S. The findings indicated that although the two groups of learners lived in very different sociolinguistic settings and studied different foreign languages, they held similar beliefs about language learning. Both groups strongly believed in the concept of aptitude for foreign language learning, a hierarchy of language, the superiority of children in language learning, and the

importance of practice and excellent pronunciation. Both groups also disagreed that those who are good at math are not good at foreign languages and all three target languages--English, French and Spanish were rated as languages of medium-difficulty.

Kern (1995) used the BALLI to examine the degree to which American foreign language students' beliefs about language learning corresponded to those of their instructors. Twelve instructors and two hundred eighty-eight university students of French participated in this study. The findings showed that overall, the students' and the instructor's beliefs were similar, but some of the students' beliefs did not match their respective instructors, particularly with respect to pronunciation, error correction and the importance of learning grammar and vocabulary. Kern indicated that instructors' practices might not be consistent with their own beliefs because the instructors had to follow the requirements of their program. Therefore, instructors' teaching practices might have a greater impact on learners' beliefs than the instructors' actual beliefs. The degree of "fitness" between teachers' and students' beliefs might "be related or depend on other factors such as instructors' personalities, teaching styles, level of experience, grading practices, choices and implementation of classroom activities" (p.80).

Oh (1996) was probably the first to use the BALLI to investigate the beliefs of students of a less commonly taught foreign language. One hundred ninety-five university students enrolled in first -and second- year Japanese classes participated in this study. The results showed that more of the second-year students tended to agree or strongly agree with the individual BALLI items. While both groups considered Japanese to be a difficult to a very difficult language, the first-year students were more optimistic than the second year-students about the time needed to become fluent in Japanese. The second- year students more strongly believed that learning a foreign language required a special aptitude than the first-year students. Both groups recognized the importance of learning culture, but the second-year students emphasized learning grammar rules

more than the first-year students. Both groups also highly valued learning Kanji and having an excellent pronunciation. They also overwhelmingly endorsed the importance of repeating and practicing a lot, showed a strong motivation to learn Japanese and had optimistic views about a better job. Oh concluded, "with the globalization of the economic communities of the world and the need for Americans to be competitive in international business, Japanese programs are attracting ambitious and motivated students. The data showed that they indeed held various beliefs and opinions that were different from students learning other commonly-taught languages" (p.67).

Several studies used the BALLI to examine EFL learners' beliefs about language learning in foreign countries. Most of the studies were conducted in East Asian countries (Japan: Luppescu & Day, 1990; Saki & Gaies, 1999. Korea: Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kim-Yoon, 2000. China: Su, 1995; Wang, 1996. Hong Kong: Benson & Lor, 1999. Taiwan: Yang, 1992; Huang, 1997; Tsai, 2003). Rapidly developing economies in East Asia make EFL learners in this area the largest EFL population in the world. The differences between East Asian and American cultures, including the language systems, makes studies on EFL learners' beliefs about language learning particularly relevant to the present study. Yang (1992) was the first to use the BALLI outside the North American context. She administered a Chinese version of the BALLI to 505 students enrolled in undergraduate English classes in Taiwan. The results indicated that EFL learners in Taiwan generally had similar beliefs about language learning to those of ESL learners in the U.S. However, EFL learners in Taiwan showed stronger agreement with traditional teaching and learning methods and more optimism about the time needed for mastering English, and their ultimate success in English than the ESL students. Many other studies in East Asian countries showed similar results (Korea: Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kim-Yoon, 2000; Su, 1995; Wang, 1996; Huang, 1997; Tsai, 2003).

Horwitz (1999) compared the beliefs about language learning reported in seven studies using the BALLI. These studies were Horwitz's study (1988) on students of German, French and Spanish, Kern's study (1995) of students and teachers of French, Oh's study (1996) of students of Japanese, Truitt's (1995) and Park's (1995) studies of Korean EFL students, Yang's study (1992) of Taiwan EFL students and Kunt's study (1997) of Turkish heritage EFL students. Horwitz chose 3 to 5 items each area of the BALLI for comparison. Horwitz identified several differences between the American foreign language learners and the EFL learners. She found, "The Asian and Turkish heritage learners were less convinced than the Americans about the relative difficulty of some languages but believed more strongly that learning vocabulary is key to foreign language learning"(p.571). She also found that the Asian and Turkish heritage learners were motivated instrumentally while American learners tended to have more integrative motivation. She argued that the differences might be caused by different culture and learning setting.

Horwitz also found some differences among the American groups. Although students of French and their instructors primarily belonged to the same cultural group, there were a wide range of differences between them on belief items related to "the difficulty of language learning, language learning aptitude, the nature of language learning, the importance of accent, and motivation for language learning" (p.571). Horwitz suggested that these differences might be caused by non-cultural factors, such as age, stage of learning, and professional status. There were also substantial belief differences between students of Japanese and students of other foreign languages. Compared with other foreign language learners, students of Japanese generally judged their target language to be more difficult and estimated more time needed for leaning it; they endorsed special language learning aptitude more strongly, but also were less positive about their own language learning abilities. In addition, they "believed in the importance of vocabulary and grammar learning while the other American learners did not"; and

they "anticipated that their language learning would lead to increased job opportunities" while the other American learners did not. Horwitz suggested that an important reason for these differences might be that "Japanese instruction attracts a different type of students than the more commonly taught language in the USA." "Like English abroad', Japanese in the US might "have greater instrumental value than the other languages" (p.572-573). Some belief differences were also identified within the EFL groups. Horwitz found that although the two Korean groups shared a common culture, there were differences between them, such as their ratings of the difficulty of English, their emphasis on grammar learning and translation and their desire to learn English to get to know English native speakers better. Horwitz argued that these differences might be caused by individual or current situational differences.

Beliefs, Motivation and Anxiety

Beliefs and Motivation

Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972) laid the foundation for the motivational theory of second language acquisition. In their classic study in 1959, Gardner and Lambert introduced the constructs of "integrative" and "instrumental" motivation in second language acquisition. Based on their definition, integrative motivation is concerned with an interest in the culture of the target language group, a desire to meet people in that language community, and to integrate oneself with the target language community. Instrumental motivation, on the other hand, represents a more practical and utilitarian reason for language learning, such as meeting the requirements for school graduation, traveling, getting a better job or enhancing professional career. Studies have generally shown that learners with integrative motivation in foreign language learning were more motivated and more successful than those with instrumental motivation (Gardner and MacIntyre, 1991; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Ellis, 1997; Chen, 2000). Integrative motivation attempts not only to obtain language

competence but also to attain psychological integration with the target culture (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991).

Although the superiority of integrative motivation over instrumental motivation was shown in the early research literature, the importance of instrumental motivation was emphasized in later studies. Gardner (1985) shifted the stress from integrative motivation to the degree or intensity of learners' motivation. Gardner (1991) and other researchers (Au, 1988; Oxford et al., 1989; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991) indicated that there might not be a uniformly superior kind of motivation in terms of ultimate foreign language performance. Gardner and his colleagues (Gardner et al., 1983; Gardner, 1985, 1988; Gardner et al., 1999) claimed that the socio-cultural context of language learning was responsible for which kinds of motivation facilitated ultimate achievement. Compared with the results of studies on ESL learners in the Philippines and French learners in Canada, Gardner found that instrumental motivation was more predictive of English achievement among Philippine ESL learners since they needed English for their career, while integrative motivation was more predictive among Canadian French learners as they learned French mainly for approaching the French-speaking Canadian population and understanding their culture**.** Foreign language learners generally choose instrumental reasons more frequently than integrative reasons to study a new language (Hudson, 2000). Importantly, Brown (2000) argued that learners rarely choose only one type of motivation, instrumental or integrative, when studying a foreign language, but rather a combination of both. MacIntyre (1991) found that instrumental motivation was effective for beginning learners of second language and that integrative motivation might not be superior to instrumental motivation.

Cultural beliefs play an important role in motivation. Gardner (1985) argued that cultural beliefs contribute to learners' motivational orientations. Based on their Socio-Educational Model of Second Language Acquisition, Gardner et al. (Gardner et al., 1983; Gardner, 1985, 1988; Gardner et al., 1999) found that

the socio-cultural milieu influenced a learner's beliefs about other cultures and languages. They argued that: "Individuals' early experiences in a specific socio-cultural context could be expected to play a role in the development of their attitudes and motivation associated with second language learning. Moreover, their experiences in the home, which may or may not be the same as their experiences in the social environment, could similarly influence their attitudes and motivation" (Gardner et al., 1999, p.422). "Another factor that may be an important determinant of second language achievement is the relative presence of the second language group in the community. Research suggests that one's degree of contact with the second language group will have an influence on the extent to which a second language is learned." However, "in monolingual communities, other contextual aspects such as the second language learning situation and parental encouragement may play a larger role in the student's motivation and achievement" (Gardner et al., 1999, p.423). With respect to the motivation of Asian students, Stigler et al. (1985) claimed that the reason Asian American students evaluated themselves more critically than Non-Asian students was that they were educated to believe that their family's and community's needs and expectations were more important than their individual desires. Wen (1997) investigated the initial motivations that led 77 first- and second-year learners of Chinese to study the language and subsequently, to continue studying the language. The results of her study showed that "intrinsic interest in Chinese culture" and "desire to understand one's own culture heritage" were the primary motivations of these students (p.235).

Ellis (1997) indicated that the dominant cultural context in a country could have a great impact on learners' beliefs about foreign language learning and ultimately their motivation towards foreign language learning. In monocultural countries such as Britain, many believed that they did not need to learn foreign a language and culture and that minority groups should assimilate into the dominant language and culture of the country. However, in other countries such

as Canada and the U.S., bilingualism and biculturalism are often advocated and encouraged. Ellis also claimed that the cultural context in an institution, such as a school, might influence second language learning and performance.

Eccles and Wigfield (Eccles, 1983; Eccles & Wigfiled, 1995) found that task value and expectancy-related beliefs could affect an individual's academic behavior, including choice, effort, persistence and achievement. They found that task value and expectancy-related beliefs were the two most important predicators of achievement behavior. Pintrich and DeGroot (1990) described expectancy as "students' beliefs that they are able to perform that task and that they are responsible for their own performance," and values as "students' goals for the task and their beliefs about the importance and interest of the task" (p.33-34). Based on observing on ESL learners, MacItyre (1995) found that students who believed English proficiency was one of the factors that determined their academic success tended to ask questions, participate in discussions and make friends with native speakers. The results of Robert's (1992) investigation of 703 university freshmen's beliefs about the value of foreign language learning showed that interest about the target language community and its culture were primary reasons for studying a foreign language. In addition, Stevenson et al. (1986) found in their observations of Chinese, Japanese and American societies that students' task value beliefs could be influenced by their cultural backgrounds. Cultural institutions, such as families and schools, played an important role in students' learning and task performance. They claimed that the values in Asian American families, such as expectations for achievement and upward mobility, obligations fulfillment, respect for education, social comparison with other Asian American families, and obedience to authority, promoted the students' educational achievements, in all academic areas. For Asian students learning another language at school was regarded as learning another skill that might be useful in the future (Okazaki & Sue, 1990).

Goal theory is one of the approaches used to understand students' motivation for academic achievement (Weiner, 1990). Dweck and Leggett (1988) claimed that learners' goals could be classified as either mastery goal or performance goals based on their implicit beliefs about intelligence and ability. Learners with a mastery goal have an incremental perspective of intelligence and regard learning as a process of self-improvement. Learners with a performance goal tend to ascribe success or failure to ability, while learners with a mastery goal tend to attribute success or failure to effort. Language learners who set goals of self-development and enjoyment tend to be more successful (Noels et al., 1999). Goal setting is also affected by social cultural contexts. Influenced by their social cultural backgrounds, Asian American students, compared with other American students, are found to set higher goals when evaluating their performance and devote more time and effort to obtaining their goals (Sigler et al., 1985).

Rotter (1966) proposed the control beliefs notion. Based on the control beliefs theory, individuals with an external locus of control believed that reinforcement occurs due to forces outside their personal control; individuals with an internal locus of control believed that reinforcements occur due to forces within their personal control. Positive relations between internal control and successful learning are reported in a number of studies (Mark, 1998). Uba (1994) found that compared with European-Americans, Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans tended to have a more external locus of control. He claimed that American cultural values and beliefs, which emphasize self-reliance, cultivate a more internal locus of control; whereas Asian cultural values and beliefs, which emphasize interdependence of people with the family or community, cultivate a more external locus of control.

Perceived efficacy beliefs can also play an important role in motivation. Self-efficacy is an individual's evaluation about his or her specific performance capabilities on a particular type of task. Self-efficacy might influence task choice, effort expenditure, and perseverance in the face of

difficulties through an inferential process involving weighing the relative contributions of many factors (Bandura, 1982, 1997). Weiner (1979) found that students' judgments of the cause of their academic success or failure offered important sources of self-efficacy. The factors, such as ability, effort, task difficulty and luck, were attributed to their academic success. Satisfaction occured when successes were ascribed to themselves rather than to external factors. Ehrman (1996) indicated that self-efficacy, linguistic self-confidence, and self-determination were powerful motivational factors for foreign language learning. Condly (1999) found that perceived efficacy was an effective predictor of academic achievement regardless of ability level, gender, age, or any other similar variable. Finally, Millier et al. (1993) found that compared to students with a low sense of efficacy, students with a high sense of efficacy were more likely to choose difficult tasks, make greater effort, persist longer, apply appropriate problem solving strategies, and have less fear and anxiety.

Interestingly, Oettingen et al. (1994) found that the theory of self-efficacy might not be applicable to students with Asian backgrounds and their achievement. The Asian American students in this study tended to underestimate their own abilities, while the Non-Asian American students overestimated their own abilities. Thus, Asian-American students reported a lower level of situational self-efficacy beliefs than Non-Asian Americans. For Asian-Americans, due to their cultural beliefs, fear of academic failure could better predict achievement than self-efficacy. Steinberg et al. (1992) found that the fear of failure, combined with beliefs in the importance of effort, made Asian American students study longer. Huang and Chang's (1998) study on ESL learners also indicated that self-efficacy might not have an important impact on Asian ESL learners.

Beliefs and Anxiety

Several studies have shown that irrational beliefs are related to high trait and state anxiety and various anxiety disorders (Albert Ellis, 1962; Lohr & Bonge, 1981; Himle et al., 1982; Deffenbacher et al., 1986; and Cramer & Fong, 1991). Ellis (1962) proposed a rational emotive model of psychotherapy based on his study of the relationship between irrational beliefs and emotional responses. Irrational beliefs or unrealistic beliefs may also have a great impact on foreign language anxiety. Young (1991) argued that learners' beliefs were a main contributor to foreign language anxiety, and Price (1991) indicated that anxiety might derive from learners' beliefs that they lack sufficient foreign language aptitude and skills. The findings of Gardner et al's (1987) study regarding the second language performance of language dropouts revealed that dropouts had significantly higher levels of language anxiety and significantly lower self-evaluations of language learning even though their foreign language achievement was not significantly different than that of continuing students. The results of Horwitz et al.'s (1986) and Horwitz's (1988) studies suggested that an over-concern for correctness in foreign language learning could increase foreign language anxiety.

Horwitz (1988) and a series of studies using the BALLI (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kern, 1995; Oh, 1996; and Kunt, 1997) showed that students had many unrealistic beliefs about foreign language learning with respect to the difficulty of language learning, language aptitude, strategies for language learning and self-evaluation of language learning. The students in these studies had an obvious over-optimism about foreign language learning, substantially, underestimating the time needed for learning a foreign language.

Beliefs based on different ethnic cultures may have an important impact on levels of anxiety. Chang (1997) reviewed a series of studies on social anxiety and East Asian culture and found that "anxiety disorders and phobias in East Asian culture are commonly expressed in the social sphere and that they are

typically other-oriented" (p.119). He contended that East Asian patterns of child-rearing practices were "moralistic" (or social), whereas Anglo-American patterns were psychological (or individualistic). He claimed**,** "the contrasting forms of social anxiety and social phobia seen in East Asian and Anglo-American culture reflect the differing viewpoints of each culture regarding the relation between individuals and their society" (p.119). A few studies have shown that Asian Americans have higher levels of trait, social, test and phobic anxiety than Caucasians (Sue & Kirk, 1973; Marsella et al., 1973; Zane et al., 1991; Berg & Jaya, 1993; Aldwin and Greenberger, 1987). The findings of Sue and Kirk's (1973) study showed that Asian American students were more emotionally distressed and anxious when compared with Caucasian students, because of different ethnic cultures. Aldwin and Greenberger (1987) noted that Koreans were more depressed and anxious than Caucasians and ascribed the differences between the two groups to their different cultural values. Interestingly, Lucas (1984) argued that Japanese students are afraid to make mistakes and are anxious to talk in ESL class because of their early education about "losing face". In addition, Truitt's (1995) study of EFL learners in Korea and Yan's (1998) study on EFL learners in China reported much higher levels of anxiety than levels found in Kunt's (1997) study of Turkish and Turkish-Cyprus EFL learners. In contrast, studies on American learners of different foreign languages in the U.S. showed relatively similar levels of foreign language anxiety (Horwitz, 1986; Aida, 1994; and Oh, 1996).

Beliefs can also be influenced by cultural conflict and adjustment to foreign environments. Lin et al.'s (2001) cross-cultural comparison of Chinese and Caucasian students in Canada with respect to state and trait anxiety showed that the Chinese students experienced significantly higher levels of trait anxiety resulting from cultural conflict and ambiguous situations than did the Caucasians. They concluded that lack of familiarity with the adopted culture and language

might contribute to a high level of anxiety and adjustment difficulties in Chinese students.

Gregersen & Horwitz's (2002) study of EFL learners in Chile showed a link between language anxiety and perfectionism. A relatively perfectionalistic belief system in Asian culture can likely cause a relatively high level of anxiety, but the positive side to this belief system can also be seen in the high achievement of Asian people (William & Rucker, 1996).

Foreign language instruction based on their improper beliefs about language learning and teaching can lead to increased levels of foreign language anxiety. Young (1991) indicated that some teachers' beliefs and related instructional methods, such as playing the role of a "drill sergeant" instead of a facilitator and immediately and constantly correcting errors were an important source of foreign language anxiety (p.428). The results of Kern's (1995) study showed that mismatches between learners' language beliefs and their teachers' might also create and increase foreign language anxiety.

Perceived proficiency can be an important source of foreign language anxiety. Bandura argued, "people experience anxiety when they perceive themselves ill-equipped to manage potentially injurious events" (p.141). Foss and Reitzel (1988) claimed that self-defeating beliefs resulted in low self-esteem, which hindered learners' foreign language learning progress. They ascribed anxiety to learners' self-perception. The findings of Clément et al.' (1985, 1994) studies showed that perceived competence and anxiety were more closely related than were perceived competence and objective achievement. Gardner et al. (1984) found that the learners' French class anxiety was most highly correlated with the factor related to self-perception of French competence. Pintrich and Degroot (1990) found that test anxiety was negatively related to self-efficacy beliefs. The results of Kondo's (1999) study on Japanese EFL learners indicated that a lack of self-confidence beliefs could prevent EFL learners from speaking English. The low perceived proficiency and confidence and the high anxiety

made the Japanese EFL learners less active speaking the target language outside the classroom.

As noted earlier, irrational or unrealistic beliefs about language learning can cause anxiety, but anxiety can also affect learners' language learning beliefs. Bandura (1982) claimed that beliefs could cause anxiety, and vice versa. He indicated that perceptions of inefficacy might lead to anxiety, and that anxiety, in turn, could affect self-efficacy beliefs. MacIntye et al. (1997) conducted a study of thirty-seven students of French in Canada with respect to their self-perceptions in foreign language and how language anxiety affected those assessments. The findings showed that language anxiety is associated negatively with both perceived and actual proficiency in French. They also found that the anxious learners tended to underestimate their competence, while less anxious learners tended to overestimate their competence.

Research on Foreign Language Anxiety

Types of Anxiety

Anxiety as a concept and psychological phenomenon has been discussed and studied for a long time. Freud (1936) saw anxiety as an unpleasant emotional state characterized by a unique combination of phenomenological and physiological qualities and thought fear resulting from the ego' reaction to external threats. Spielberger (1966) defined anxiety as "subjective, consciously perceived feelings of apprehension and tension, accompanied by or associated with activation or arousal of the autonomic nervous system" (p.16). Spielberger further divided anxiety into "trait" and "state" anxiety. More recently the term "situation-specific anxiety" was put forward to particularly describe foreign language anxiety (Horwitz et al., 1986). Trait, state and situation-specific

perspective have become three approaches to the study of anxiety (MacIntye & Gardner, 1991a).

Trait, State Anxiety and Situation Anxiety

Spielberger (1972) defined trait anxiety as "relatively stable individual differences in anxiety proneness, that is, to differences in the disposition to perceive a wide range of stimulus situations as threatening" (p.39). In contrast, he defined state anxiety as "a transitory emotional state or condition of the human organism…This condition is characterized by subjective, consciously perceived feeling of tension and apprehension, and activation of the autonomic nervous system" (p.39) "Trait anxiety is conceptualized as a relatively stable personality characteristic while state anxiety is seen as a response to a particular anxiety-provoking stimulus such as an important test" (Horwitz, 2001. p.113). Trait anxiety "has been shown to impair cognitive functioning to disrupt memory, to lead to avoidance behaviors, and to have several other effects" (Eysenck, 1979; in MacIntye & Gardner, 1991c, p.87). State anxiety is the apprehension, which takes place at a particular moment (Spielberger, 1983) and often accompanies physical signs such as "perspiration, sweaty palms, dry mouth, muscle contractions and tension, and increases in heart and perspiration rates" (Onwuebuze et al., 2000, p.88).

Situation specific anxiety is a type of anxiety that is experienced in a specific situation over time. "Situation-specific constructs can be seen as trait anxiety measures limited to a given context. Respondents are tested for their anxiety reactions in a well-defined situation such as public speaking, writing examinations, performing math, or participating in a foreign language class" (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a, p.91) Due to the characteristics of situation anxiety, "the term situation-specific anxiety has been used to emphasize the persistent and multi-faceted nature of some anxieties" (Horwitz, 2001, p.113),

including public speaking anxiety and foreign language anxiety. Gardner (1985) argued that "a construct of anxiety which is not general but instead is specific to the language acquisition context is related to second language achievement" (p.284). Some researchers maintain that the most suitable measures for foreign language anxiety are the situation-specific measures (MacIntye & Gardner, 1991a).

Endler (1975, 1983, 1988, and 1997) proposed a multidimensional interaction model of anxiety to explain how personal and situational variables interact to produce anxiety responses. In his model, state and trait anxiety are multidimensional. State anxiety has two dimensions, a cognitive-worry component and an autonomic-emotional component. Trait anxiety has at least four dimensions: social evaluation, physical danger, ambiguous situations and daily routines (Endler et al., 1989). Endler et al. used this model to study anxiety in Asian immigrants in North America, especially Chinese, and found that their anxious behaviors are multidimensional, with person variables (Chinese culture) and situation variables (immigrant experiences) interacting to produce their specific anxiety responses (Lin & Endler et al. 2001).

Facilitating and Debilitating Anxiety

Alpert and Haber (1960) argued that learning and performance are affected both by facilitating anxiety and debilitating anxiety. Facilitating anxiety can improve performance, whereas debilitating anxiety can hinder performance (Alpert & Haber, 1960 and Kleinmann, 1977). "Facilitating anxiety motivates the learner to 'fight' the new learning task; it gears the learner emotionally for approval behavior. Debilitating anxiety, in contrast, motivates the learner to 'flee' the new learning task; it stimulate the individual emotionally to adopt avoidance behavior" (p.139).

Foreign Language Anxiety

Brown (1973) pointed out that the construct of anxiety was intricately intertwined with self-esteem, inhibition, and risk-taking. Howitz et al. (1986) defined language anxiety as " a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process"(p.128). According to Young (1991) foreign language anxiety can manifest itself via a "distortion of sounds, inability to produce the intonation and rhythm of the language, 'freezing up' when called on to perform, and forgetting words or phrases just learned or simply refusing to speak and remaining silent" (p.430). Based on a synthesis of research conducted in formal and informal contexts, Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) provided a definition of language anxiety as "the apprehension experienced when a situation requires the use of a second language with which the individual is not fully proficient" (p.5). Thus, foreign language anxiety appears to be a complex, multidimensional phenomenon (Young, 1991), best described as a form of situation-specific anxiety The concept of language anxiety has been tested empirically and found to be distinct from other type of anxieties (Horwitz, 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991).

Early Studies

"Since the mid 1960s scholar have entertained the possibility that anxiety interferences with second language learning and performance; however, documentation of that relationship came much later" (Horwitz, 2001, p.113). Scovel (1978) reviewed several studies on anxiety and language learning and found a series of conflicting results. Some studies found a negative relationship between anxiety and foreign language learning, but others found positive or no relationship between them. Because of a considerable amount of conflicting

findings, the early research on the role of anxiety in foreign language learning showed ambiguity (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989). Scovel (1978) explained that the conflicting findings resulted from different anxiety measures used in the various studies and concluded that "language researchers should be specific about the type of anxiety they are measuring" (Horwitz, 2001, p.113).

Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety

Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) found that early researchers have "neither adequately defined foreign language anxiety nor described its effects on foreign language learning" (Horwitz, et al., 1986, p.28). They proposed "that a situation-specific anxiety construct which they called foreign language anxiety was responsible for students' negative emotional reactions to language learning (Horwitz, 2001, p.114). Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope defined foreign language anxiety as " a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process". They argued, "communication apprehension, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation provide useful conceptual building blocks for a description of foreign language anxiety" (Horwitz, et al., 1986, p.128). Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope were the first to treat foreign language anxiety as a separate distinct phenomenon particular to foreign language learning (Young, 1991). They developed an instrument, the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), to capture specific anxiety reactions in foreign language learning. A series of studies using the FCLAS "have found a consistent moderate specific negative correlation between the FLCAS and measures of second language achievement (typically final grades)" (Horwitz, 2001, p.114).

Effects of Foreign Language Anxiety

1. Theoretical explorations

From the perspective of second language acquisition, Krashen proposed the Monitor Model (Krashen, 1981; 1982a and 1985). Focusing on the effects of anxiety on input and processing, Krashen put forward an "affective filter" hypothesis. He suggested that the affective filter restrained a second language learner from getting input and hindered their progress in foreign language study. He argued "low-anxiety situations are more conductive to language acquisition than high-anxiety situation, and … people with high self-confidence and self-esteem acquire faster than those without these characteristics" (Krashen, 1982b, p.24). According to Krashen, a high affective filter including a high level of anxiety would increase the difficulty of second language acquisition and a low affective filter would do the opposite. Krashen (1985) also argued that the existence of an "out filter" prevented a second language learner from being able to perform based on their competence. Krashen's theory has had a great influence in the area of second language acquisition. "Many language teachers and researchers have been concerned about the possibility that anxiety may function as an affective filter, preventing learners from achieving a high level of proficiency in a foreign language" (p.155) (Aida, 1994).

Focusing on the relationship between anxiety and the learning process, Tobias (1979 and 1986) proposed a three-stage model dealing with the debilitating effects of anxiety. Tobias asserted that the effects of anxiety include both the performance and cognitive processing stage and hypothesized that anxiety could interfere with learning at three stages: input, processing, and output. Anxiety could prevent learners from attending to new information and encoding it during the input stage. Then it could obstruct learner from organizing and assimilation new information during the processing stage. Finally, during the output stage, it could interfere with the retrieval of previously learned information. Among the three stages, Tobias argued "preprocessing interference is most debilitating to students, since the greater the restriction of input the

smaller the proportion of the instructional content available for process". Therefore**,** anxiety was also expected to be "accumulative" and further interfered with process and retrieval of information during the processing and output stages (Tobias, 1979, p.575). MacIntyre and Gardner (1989 and 1994b) employed Tobials' model to examine the effects of foreign language anxiety. They examined the effects of "Communicative Anxiety" and "General Anxiety" on the input, processing, and output stages in foreign language learning and found that both the learning and production of a foreign language were affected. They also found that language anxiety was connected to increased effort. "The increased effort at the Processing stage during the learning trials eventually reduced the effects of anxiety at the Output stage" (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1994b, p.301).

Based on his study on task-relevant and task-irrelevant cognition of anxious individuals' attention, Eysenck (1979) proposed a reconceptualization of the effect of anxiety on memory and learning. He expounded: "worry and other task-irrelevant cognitive activities associated with anxiety always impair the quality of performance. The major reason for this is that the task-irrelevant information involved in worry and cognitive self-concern competes with task –relevant information for space in the processing system. As a result, highly anxious subjects are effectively in a dual-task or divided-attention situation, in contrast to non-anxious subjects who primarily process task-relevant information" (p.364). Therefore, the task-irrelevant cognitive activities result in inefficient cognitive performance. Eysenck further specified the effects of anxiety on the quality of performance and cognitive processing effectiveness**.** Because of anxiety, anxious individuals increased effort that could compensate for the negative influence of anxiety. Eysenck's study showed that measuring the quality of performance alone could not determine the negative effects of anxiety on the_effectiveness of cognitive processing. MacIntyre and Gardner's study (1994b) supported Eysenck's argument. However, Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) reported that anxious students' extra efforts did not always improve their performance. It

appears that the degree and usefulness of the additional efforts made by anxious individuals determined the influence on the quality of their performance.

2. Measures of Foreign Language Anxiety

In order to examine the effects and levels of foreign language anxiety, several researchers have developed situation-specific measures of foreign language anxiety. The French Class Anxiety Scale, included in the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery, designed by Gardner and Smythe (1975), was the first measure of anxiety specific to second language learning. Gardner, Smythe, Clément and Gliksman (1976) used the French Class Anxiety Scale to examine more than 1000 English-speaking students in grades 7 through 11 learning French as a second language. The findings of their study showed that French class anxiety was negatively correlated with French proficiency. Based on the French Class Anxiety Scale, Gardner and his colleagues further developed the English Use Anxiety Scale (Clément, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977), the English Test Anxiety Scale (Clément, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977) and the French Use Anxiety Scale (Gardner, Smythe & Clément, 1979). Muchnick & Wolfe (1982) developed the Spanish Use Anxiety Scale.

Several other studies have used these measures and their variations to study the relationship between anxiety and second language acquisition, especially language proficiency. These studies include Tucker et al. (1976), Gliksman (1981), and Lalonde's (1982) and Trylong's (1987) studies on French learners, Ely's (1986) study on Spanish learners, Kleinmann's (1977) study on Spanish/Portuguese and Arabic ESL learners, and Sanchez-Herrero's (1992) study on Spanish ESL learners.

The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) is "a self-report measure which assesses the degree of anxiety, as evidenced by negative performance expectancies and social comparisons, psycho-physiological symptoms, and avoidance behaviors" (Horwitz et al., 1986, p.559). The FLCAS has become the most widely used anxiety measure in foreign language learning

research. The studies using the FLCAS and its variations include Aida (1994) and Oh's (1996) studies of Japanese learners, Owuegbuzie et al's (1999) study of French, Spanish, German and Japanese learners, Bailey et al.'s (1999) study of French and Spanish learners, Spitalli's (2000) study of French, Spanish, German learners, Coulombe's (2000) study of French learners, and Rodriguez (1995), Truitt (1997), Kunt (1997) Kim (1998) and Yan's (1998) studies on ESL learners in various countries.

The development of situation-specific measures of foreign language anxiety has lessened the problems of the inclusive findings in early studies. "Studies using the FLCAS and other specific measures of second language anxiety have found a consistent moderate negative correction between the FLCAS and measures of second language learning achievement (typically final grades)" (Horwitz, 2001).

Potential Sources of Foreign Language Anxiety

MacIntyre and Gardner (1991a) pointed out that "Anxiety is one of the best predictors of success in the second language"(p.96). Research using various foreign language anxiety measures found that "anxiety poses several potential problems for the student of a foreign language because it can interfere with the acquisition, retention and production of the new language" (p.86). In order to reduce the negative effects of foreign language anxiety, it is necessary and important to find the sources of foreign language anxiety.

Through interviewing students who considered themselves to be anxious about foreign language learning, Price (1991) found that speaking the target language in front of other students was the greatest source of anxiety for all interviewees. Price's study also indicated that foreign language instructors played an important role in the anxiety experienced by students. Students' foreign language anxiety levels could be decreased or increased by instructor's behavior,

attitude and teaching methods. The findings of Koch and Terrell's (1991) study in natural approach classes showed that certain classroom activities related to speaking the target language, such as giving presentations or taking oral quizzes, made students more anxious. The result of Young's (1990) study on both university and high school students learning Spanish showed that "students experience higher level of anxiety when they have to speak in the foreign language, but the real anxiety-evoking situation is having to speak or perform in front of others" (p.546).

Bailey's (1983) study on the diaries of eleven foreign language learners showed that learners' competitive characteristics could be a source of anxiety. The diaries showed that these learners tend to become anxious because of "overt self-comparison of the language learner," "a desire to outdo other language learners," "concern with tests and grades," and "a desire to gain the teacher's approval" (p.93). Price's (1991) study also found that many anxious students tended to have low self-esteem about their language skills and thought that their abilities were worse than those of other students. Young (1991) noted that language anxiety could result from learners who started out with a perceived low ability level. Price (1991) found that "overtly perfectionistic" orientation might be a cause of anxiety. Gregersen & Horwitz (2002) also showed a link between foreign language anxiety and perfectionism. They concluded that "procedures that have been used to help individuals overcome perfectionism may also be useful in helping anxious foreign or second language learners" (p.562).

Price (1991) indicated that the foreign language anxiety levels of students could be either decreased or increased by instructors' behaviors, attitudes, and teaching methods. Kern (1995) found that mismatches between teachers' and students' beliefs about foreign language learning could be a cause of language anxiety. Several studies found that instructors' harsh error correction methods could cause foreign language anxiety (Horwitz et al., 1986; Horwitz, 1988; Young, 1990; Koch & Terrell, 1991, Price, 1991 and Aida et al., 1994). For example,

Samimy's (1994) study showed that instructors' nonjudgmental attitudes could decrease learners' anxiety and help their foreign language learning. Proulx (1991) found that an instructor's personal acquaintance with learners could consciously avert hash behaviors and prevent stress.

Young (1991) argued that learners' beliefs were a main contributor to foreign language anxiety. Horwitz et al. (1986) and Horwitz (1988) argued that an over-concern for correctness could increase anxiety. Gardner et al (1987) revealed that significantly higher levels of language anxiety and significantly lower self-evaluations of language learning could make some students become dropouts, though their foreign language achievements had no significant differences from those of continuing students, Horwitz (1988) and other studies using the BALLI (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kern, 1995; Oh, 1996; and Kunt, 1997) found that the students had many unrealistic beliefs about foreign language learning which could lead to anxiety.

Ishii (1978) found five main differences between American culture and Japanese culture: group vs. individual; aesthetic vs. cognitive style of communicating; persuasive vs. non-persuasive talk; total understanding vs. no understanding; and direct vs. non-directive talk. Several cross-cultural studies have suggested that Asians might be particular susceptible to anxiety as a cultural group (Nguyen, 1982; Schwarz & Birn, 1995; Sue & Morishima, 1982).

Cultural conflict and adjustment in foreign environments for study and living can also cause a high level of anxiety. Lin et al.'s (2001) made a cross-cultural comparison of Chinese and Caucasian students in Canada with respect to state and trait anxiety. They found that the Chinese students experienced significant higher levels of trait anxiety resulting from ambiguous situations and daily routines than did the Caucasians. Of all the possible background variables tested, Lack of English fluency was the single most powerful predictor of trait anxiety. They concluded that lack of familiarity with the adopted culture and language might contribute to a high level of anxiety and adjustment difficulties in

Chinese students. Culture can also play an important role in foreign language anxiety. Truitt's (1995) study of EFL learners in Korea and Yan's (1998) study on EFL learners in China reported much higher levels of anxiety using the FLCAS than that found in Kunt's (1997) study of Turkish and Turkish-Cyprus EFL learners. However, some studies on American learners of foreign languages in the U.S. showed relatively similar levels of foreign language anxiety (Horwitz, 1986; Aida, 1994; and Oh, 1996).

CHAPTER 3

OVERVIEW OF STUDY ABROAD AND TEACHING CHINESE AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Every year thousands of students worldwide leave home for the purpose of participating in an educational experience in a country or province other than their own. Recent figures indicate that 514, 763 international students came to the United States to study in 1999/2000. China's 54,466 students is the largest group, accounting for 10.5% of all the international students (IIE, 2001). There also were 129,770 American students in study abroad programs in 1998/1999. "Over the past four years, U.S. students studying abroad have increased over 45%". This growth is much faster than international students studying in the U.S., which increased only 11% over the same period (IIE, 2001). "Since 1991/92, the number of students studying abroad has more than doubled (from 71,154 to 160,920, an increase of 126%) (IIE, 2003). The National Security Education Program provides grants to facilitate overseas study outside of Europe for a new population of up to 450 American undergraduate and graduate students per year (Desruisseaux, 1993).

The distinction between foreign language and second language is usually based on whether the language is used as the main tool for communication outside the classroom. Therefore, learning Chinese in the U.S. is considered as a foreign language situation, whereas learning Chinese in Taiwan or China is a second language situation. It has long been assumed that the combination of immersion in the native speech community, integrated with formal classroom learning, creates the best environment for learning a second language. The strength of this assumption is so powerful that there has evolved a popular belief, one shared by students and teachers, parents and administrators, that

students who go abroad are those who will ultimately become the most proficient in the use of their language of specialization.

While the general benefits of study abroad have been widely described in a number of articles (Byram, 1988; Carlson, Burn, et al., 1990; Goodwin & Nacht, 1988; Milleret, 1990; Burn et al, 1990; King & Young, 1994; Meara, 1994), these reports tend to deal with issues such as preparation for the study abroad experience, program assessment, student evaluations, general policy issues, and overall benefits that result from a study abroad experience. Almost all of the study abroad studies focus on students from third world countries studying in industrial countries, such as the U.S. as well as students from industrial countries studying in other industrial countries, such as the U.S., France, and Germany. Very few study abroad studies focus on students from industrial countries studying in third world countries. As a group, these studies contain little empirically based research that describes or analyzes the impact of a study abroad cultural context on students who have been abroad. The main reason for that is because there have been very few students from industrial countries studying in less-developed countries in the past. The studies have been conducted in West European countries, where social cultural contexts, even language systems, are quite similar to the U.S., and the specific target languages are easier to learn (compared with less commonly taught foreign languages).

Recently, more and more American students are interested in learning Chinese language and culture, especially in China. These students range from astute business perspectives to scholars fascinated by the ancient civilization of this largest Asian nation. However, the different language systems and social cultural contexts between China and the U.S. make the study abroad experience of American students learning Chinese in China very different from the experiences of students who learn commonly taught foreign languages in West European countries. Many of the Chinese students experience high foreign

language anxiety and cultural shock because of different education system, teaching methods, leaning situation and living environment (Xu, 1986). Because of the special characteristics of the Chinese language, the status of China in the world as well as the lack of studies of students learning a less commonly taught foreign language abroad, especially students from industrialized countries studying in less industrialized countries, it is important to understand the characteristics of American students who study Chinese in China.

Development of Study Abroad in the U.S.

Study abroad programs have a long history in the U.S. and there have been a number of important developments recently:

1. In 1998-1999, 60.12% of American students chose Western European countries to study, however, the share of American students studying in Western Europe has fallen by 18% since 1985-1986. Mexico, Australia, Costa Rica, Israel, China and Japan have seen increased enrollments recently (IIE, 2001).

2. Compared with international students studying in the U.S., American students studying abroad have increased faster recently. American students studying abroad have increased over 45% from 1997 to 2000, while international students coming to the U.S. increased 11% (IIE, 2001).

3. Although study abroad is receiving increased attention, only 1 to 2 percent of all undergraduate students study abroad prior to graduation. In addition, students who participate in study abroad programs do not reflect the diverse population of students enrolled in U.S. undergraduate programs (Hoffa, 1994).

4. Study abroad students used to tend to be full-time white female undergraduate students studying social sciences or humanities in Western Europe (Hoffa, 1994). Recently, however, more and more students are studying

various subjects related to business opportunities for their future careers in East and South Asia, Latin America, and Australia (IIE. 2001).

5. Adult students (25 years of age and older) are underrepresented in study abroad programs. 43% of study abroad students go during their junior year. Graduate students have remained a very small proportion (7%) of all study abroad enrollments (Davis, 1998).

6. More and more students choose short programs in the summer and winter terms, rather than enrolling in the semester and yearlong programs. Most of students study abroad one semester or less (Davis, 1998; IIE, 2001).

History and Development of Learning Chinese in the U.S.

American undergraduate and graduate student enrollment in Chinese language has increased rapidly recently. From 1990 to 1998, among the ten most popular foreign languages, only three foreign language enrollments increased. Enrollment in Chinese language program has increased 48.22%. The other two languages are Spanish, which increased 19.24% and Italian, which increased 1.85% (Brod & Welles, 2000). The total enrollment of students in Chinese in foreign language programs moved from 9th in 1990 to 6th in 1998. Student enrollment in Japanese is still a little larger than Chinese and No.1 in less commonly taught foreign languages. However, compared with 48.22 % increase in Chinese from 1990 to 1998, enrollment in Japanese decreased 27.49% from 1990 to 1998 (Brod and Welles, 2000).

Although enrollment in Chinese has increased substantially, the total number of students taking Chinese in U.S. institutions of higher education was 28,456 in the fall of 1998, only 7% of the whole foreign language enrollment (Brod and Welles, 2000). In the U.S., Chinese is known as one of the less commonly taught languages. Two reasons might explain why Chinese is not a mainstream foreign language in the United States. One might be that Chinese is

perceived to be one of the most difficult languages, according to a survey conducted by Walton in 1989. Another reason might be the strong Western tradition, which results in what Swaffar (1989) terms "a national mind set" connected to French, German and Spanish rather than languages such as Chinese and Japanese (Swaffar, 1989; Walton, 1989).

A great surge in interest in learning and teaching Chinese started in the early forties with U.S. involvement in World War ll. An intensive language project developed in the early forties by American Council of Learning Societies focus on uncommonly taught languages with potential military and diplomatic importance (Thompson et al. (1990). The US government brought together academic linguists and native speakers of Chinese to design language courses for training diplomatic and military personnel. The principles used in designing these language courses were based on mainly learning theories of behaviorism. The materials developed for this instruction consisted of graded presentation of explanations of linguistic structures followed by pattern drills (Chi, 1989).

The visit of former President Nixon to China, the reestablishment of diplomatic relations with Beijing and especially the opening of China to the West has inspired and raised interests in learning Chinese. There were only twenty-five universities in the U. S. that offered degree programs in Chinese language in 1968. In 1990, 407 universities had Chinese language programs (Huber, 1996). Student numbers enrolled in Chinese language programs increased from 6,238 in the fall 1970 to 28,450 in the fall 1998 (Brod and Welles, 2000). A growing number of Chinese language programs have also been introduced at the secondary level, in smaller colleges, and in special programs for adults and career professionals. The opening of China caused a number of pedagogical shifts: the rise of Pinyin as a standard pronunciation system, a shift toward simplified characters, a concern with the difference between the Chinese language taught in the U.S. and the "real Chinese" spoken in China. The text materials produced in China began to be accepted gradually in the US universities.

Special Characteristics of Learning and Teaching Chinese in the U.S.

The Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State has defined four categories of foreign languages on the basis of the difficulty for native speakers of English. It is significant that the most commonly taught languages---Spanish and French---are both Category I languages. The less commonly taught languages, such as Japanese, Chinese, Korean and Arabic, on the other hand, are included into Category IV. According to FSI figures, for the level of proficiency, students need to take 1320 hours of instruction in a Category IV language in comparison with only 480 hours of instruction in Category I languages (Walker, 1989).

As one of the less commonly taught languages, the Chinese language has the same features as others. However, because of its unique language system and special social, cultural and historical factors, Chinese language learning and teaching in the U.S. also has its own special characteristics.

1. Unique Tonal and Writing System

Mandarin Chinese has four tones. Two spoken words, virtually identical except for a difference in tone, will have different meanings and separate characters. Since Western languages do not have tonal systems that affect lexical meaning, the Chinese tone system is a difficulty for Western learners when learning to pronounce and always causes ambiguity to understand.

The writing system developed in China more than four thousand years ago is fundamentally different from that of the systems used in Western societies. English, along with many other Western languages, has an alphabetic system. Each word consists of a series of graphemes (letters) and words are separated by spaces. In contrast, the Chinese writing system has a distinctive logographic writing system with high visual complexity. Instead of using written symbols to represent sounds, the Chinese language uses symbols to represent "words"

(meanings). Each Chinese character is monosyllabic. However, characters and sounds do not have a one-to-one correspondence. Many homophonic words have different written representations that stand for different meanings. On the other hand, some of these characters virtually provide no clue to the pronunciation or the meaning of the words they represent. The independence of written script from spoken language makes Chinese learning a formidable and time-consuming task. For Chinese language learners who want develop their reading and writing ability, learning Chinese characters will be probably their lifetime work.

2. Diversity of Student Population

The student population of Chinese has great diversity and is quite different from the population of learners of other foreign languages. Pease (1996) listed the nine kinds of students learning Chinese in the U.S.: (1) Younger native English speakers; (2) Older English speakers; (3) Native Japanese speakers; (4) Native Korean speakers; (5) Ethnic Chinese from Vietnam; (6) Ethnic Vietnamese; (7) Ethnic Chinese from Indonesia; (8) Students from Hong Kong; (9) Chinese American who speak Mandarin but not read well. I think we can divide students learning Chinese mainly into three groups: Chinese heritage students, Non-Chinese heritage Asian students, and Non-Asian background students. Because of their parents' Chinese language and culture background and attending the Sunday schools of Chinese, many Chinese heritage students can speak Chinese and have mastered some degree of Chinese characters when they start to learn Chinese in universities. Some of them take Chinese mainly to get excellent grade to raise their GPA score. Many Chinese heritage students from the state of California and New York City can speak fluent Cantonese but not any Mandarin. For them, learning Chinese is mainly learning to speak Mandarin. For Chinese heritage students from overseas, who mainly come from Southeast Asia and study business area, their

Chinese background and original Chinese language level can be quite different. Some do not know anything about Chinese, some can speak but not read, and some can read but not speak Mandarin. Students from Hong Kong can read and understand Chinese characters but cannot speak Mandarin. The main purpose for students from Southeast Asia to learn Chinese is because it is easy and also important for their future career. They especially want to improve their oral Chinese, which will be very useful when they go back to their countries to do business with China.

Non-Chinese heritage Asian students mainly refer to Korean and Japanese students as well as some ethnic Southeast Asian students. Korean and Japanese language and cultural development is connected with the Chinese language and culture. Some features of their languages are similar to Chinese, especially Japanese Kanji, which uses almost the same Chinese characters, though the pronunciation is completely different. Because their language and culture is closer to Chinese language and culture than Western language and culture, as well as important geography, history and business connection with China, it might be easier and more meaningful for them to learn Chinese, compared with other foreign languages.

Most Non-Asian background students are white students. Some have already studied one or two even three foreign languages. Some haven not studied any foreign language. Unlike the other two groups in which almost all students are from 18 to 24, the age range of this group is much wider. Some of them are in their 30s even 40s. The purpose for them to learn Chinese is various. Some are studying Oriental Medicine, others are Asian Studies or business majors, and some have personal connections with China, or are curious. Compared with other two groups, Chinese is much more difficult for them to learn, especially the writing system.

The diversity of background and different original Chinese level constitute a unique Chinese language student population, and make Chinese language

learning and teaching, especially in first and second years, more challenge than other foreign languages.

3. Variety of Textbook and Language Emphasis

Because of the special political and immigrant situation of Chinese people in the U.S. and the complex Chinese language system, the textbooks used and language emphasis taught in the U.S. has become a complicated issue. Three sources of textbooks, Mainland China, Taiwan and English speaking countries, have been chosen in different Chinese Sunday schools, secondary schools, and higher education institutions in the U.S. The textbooks published in Mainland China adopt Ping Ying phonetic notation and simplified Chinese characters. The textbooks from Taiwan use Zhu Ying Fu Hao, a completely different phonetic notation and traditional Chinese characters. The textbooks written and edited by native English speakers, beside these two phonetic notion system, even have other phonetic systems such Wade-Giles and Yale systems. In addition, textbook from these three areas are different not just pedagogically and social culturally, but also in the way and style of content editing and organization. There are strong disagreements on which words constitute a minimum vocabulary, when should start to introduce Chinese characters, which grammar system should be used and so on.

Before 1990, the Chinese language teaching had been dominated by teachers originally from Taiwan or American teachers who had learned Chinese and trained as Chinese language teachers in Taiwan. Therefore, almost all Chinese textbooks used in the U.S. at that time were from Taiwan or written by native English speakers.

In recent years, more and more Chinese students from Mainland China have come to the U.S. for study. They brought the Ping Yin system and simplified Chinese characters all over the U.S. Some of them even became instructors and

teaching assistants of Chinese. As China becomes more and more important to the U.S. and in the world, and because Ping Yin system and simplified Chinese characters are much easier to learn, textbooks from Mainland China have become more and more popular in higher education institutions in the U.S. However, the different background of growing up, experience of learning and teaching, knowledge of Chinese, and influence of senior colleagues still make Chinese language teachers choose different textbooks and focus on different language emphasis.

4. Overemphasis of Reading

In Chinese language class, there has always been more emphasis on reading and writing than on listening comprehension and speaking. Although most programs place an emphasis on listening and comprehension skills during the first year of instruction, they also place a great deal of emphasis on the reading and writing of characters during the first year. It is quite common for programs to use a combination of "reader" and "non-reader" types of materials for their first year courses. However, many programs now even use the "reader" types of materials for their first year courses only. According to two studies (Eddy 1980, Ning 1983), the most widely used textbooks during the first year were DeFrancis' Beginning Chinese, which was a "non-reader" type of material, and Wang's Read Chinese, which was a "reader." Wang's (1989) study showed that most popular textbook in the universities was "Practical Chinese Reader" (published by Beijing Language and Culture University, China). Chi (1989) claimed that while we could always find quite elaborate materials to be read for courses at various levels, we did not find the same kind of elaborations for listening comprehension and speaking skills. The reasons for this overemphasis on reading might be related to Chinese language system and Chinese traditional Because of the complicated Chinese writing system, both teachers and learners naturally expect to spend more

time on reading character-text materials and writing characters. According to Chinese culture, books are thought of as an embodiment of knowledge, wisdom and truth and reading has traditionally been considered a more important and attainable skill.

Although the main purpose of the most students especially Non-Asian background students is to develop their listening and speaking skills, the choice of 'reader' type instructional materials for classes, an overemphasis on reading and writing, and a lack of interest and expertise in language pedagogy make them easily frustrated and hardly attain their purpose.

Foreign Language Instruction in China

Foreign language instruction in China has been influenced by both internal and external factors such as political, cultural and social factors as well as knowledge of other languages.

Foreign language teaching was first introduced in China in the mid-19th century when China was forced to open its door to the West. Two group of educators initiated foreign language instruction in China: English-speaking missionaries, who viewed foreign language training as the path to bring the hearts and minds of the Chinese people to Christian God, and 19th century Chinese reformers, who regarded foreign language competency as necessary for mastering foreign technical expertise and diplomatic procedure. Chinese reformers established the language school Tongwenguan in 1862 (Wang, 1981). With the exception of a handful of military and technical government schools, missionary schools were virtually the only institutions in China that taught foreign languages before the late 19th century (Ross, 1993). The methodology in schools during this period of the foreign language instruction was the grammar translation method (Wang, 1981).

In 1922, British and American educational systems were introduced into China. During this period the methodology and linguistics of Western country were also gradually introduced into China. Phonetics was taught in some schools, and the International Phonetic transcriptions were used to take the place of those of the Webster and Oxford dictionaries. The direct-method approach was introduced in the schools and became a great challenge to the grammar translation approach. The direct method had considerable influence over the foreign language instruction in China before World War II (Wang, 1981).

In 1949, The Chinese revolution drove all foreigners out of the country and closed down missionary schools and colleges. The new Chinese government considered missionary schools as tools used by the imperialists for cultural invasion. The political situation made China look to the Soviet Union. Because most of the foreign equipment, technique and technicians were from the Soviet Union, there was a great demand to learn Russian. The teaching of Russian developed very rapidly in colleges and high schools throughout China in the 1950s. During the latter half of the 1960s, attitudes toward Russian teaching began to change due to the Sino-Soviet split. The teaching of foreign languages was extended to include English, French, and German. Then, the Cultural Revolution (1966-76) turned China's global view inward and foreign language education in China almost completely stopped from 1966 to 1971 and began to resume a little from 1972.

In 1979, China initiated four modernization programs in agriculture, industry, national defense, and technology. The opening of China's door and possibilities for a better life, has aroused great enthusiasm for studying foreign languages, especially English. English is chosen by more than 99% of students and universities for the foreign language requirement. There is a huge demand for qualified English teachers. Foreign language teacher training is actually English teacher training (Yearbook of China Education 1949-1981, and 1994).

The methods commonly used in foreign language instruction in China are

"eclectic" or "composite" methods, which combine grammar translation, direct and audio lingual approaches together, and the communicative method. The former method is commonly used by Chinese foreign language teachers in most secondary schools and universities and has been known as the Chinese foreign language teaching method. The latter method is commonly used by foreign language teaching experts and teachers, and Chinese foreign language teachers who have studied abroad. Therefore, the communicative method is also called the Western foreign language teaching method (Cowan, 1979; Harvey, 1985; Burnaby, 1989; Dzau, 1990) and is generally primarily used for teaching English. Only Chinese teaching method had been used in foreign language instruction until 1979. The communicative method brought by some foreign language-teaching experts and teachers was at first unwelcome in English classes (Well, 1986; Burnaby, 1989; Dzau, 1990). Although the communicative method becomes more and more popular in China especially in big cities, there are large differences in opinion on which method is suitable for China's situation. Chinese foreign language teachers believe that the communicative method is mainly applicable in China for those students who plan to go a foreign language-speaking country. The Chinese teaching method is mainly applicable for Chinese students to learn the analytical skills and knowledge of foreign language grammar that they will need in China from reading technical articles to translation of documents. There are also constraints on implementing Western foreign language teaching method, such as the context of the wider curriculum, influence of the traditional teaching methods from Chinese learning, large class size and busy schedules, scarce resource and equipment, and especially shortage of qualified teachers (Harvey, 1985; Burnaby, 1989; Dzau, 1990; Strong, 1992).

Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language in China

The early period of teaching Chinese as a foreign language can be dated to the sixth century during the Sui and Tang Dynasties. The students were foreign Buddhist monks who wanted to translated Buddhist scriptures and spread Buddhism in China (Zhang, 1989). The capital city, Chang-An, of the Tang Dynasty became the center of culture and education. Foreign students from neighboring countries came to study and visit there. At one time there was an estimated population of over eight thousand foreign students in that city (Meskill, 1973). During the Tang Dynasty, the Japanese government sent diplomatic envoys many times to China by boats. Many Japanese Buddhist monks and students came with them to Chang An to learn Chinese language and culture. In the year 834 alone, 650 Buddhist monks and students came by diplomatic envoys' boats. There were more Buddhist monks and students coming to China for study by business boats. Among them, Jiebei Zhengbei and Abei Zhongmaru are two famous monk students, who had a great influence on Japanese language culture after they returned to Japan. After the Tang Dynasty, the teaching Chinese as foreign language went down gradually, though many foreign students still came to China to learn Chinese language and culture (Zhang, 1989).

Besides Japan, the Korean government also sent many students to Chang An to learn Chinese language and Chinese culture. Korea had adopted Chinese characters as their writing system until 1444. The earliest Chinese instructional materials cited by scholars are Lao Qida and Piao Tongshi. It has been generally accepted that both books were produced during the 14th century for Korean students. The similar visions of these two books were used as Chinese language textbooks in Korea from the 15th until the 19th century (Wadley, 1987).

The first steady influx of Western missionaries into China took place during the first part of the 17th century. Since then until the middle of the 20th century, Westerners in China had a significant impact on Chinese society. Some of these Westerners, particularly missionaries and merchants, must have made an effort to learn the language. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the

Chinese government or any of its schools provided formal instruction of Chinese for these foreigners (Chi, 1989).

The Chinese Government started the teaching Chinese as a foreign language (TCAFL) program as early as 1950, when the People's Republic of China (PRC) had just been founded. A good basis for the growth of TCAFL in China was created during the 1950s. The first group of foreign students to come to the new China consisted of 30 students from Eastern Europe. A special course of the Chinese language was set up at Qinghua University in Beijing under the direct care of the Ministry of Education. In autumn of 1952, the class was moved to Beijing University. The new class admitted students from all countries that had established diplomatic relations with China and from the places where people were struggling for national independence. The annual enrolment rose to about 100 students (Lu, 1989).

With the requirement from the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Chinese Government accepted 25 Vietnamese students majoring in Chinese language in 1953. Two special schools were founded for these Vietnamese students in Nanning and Guiling, two of China's southern cities near Sino-Vietnamese border. After a one-year course there, the students transferred to colleges or universities for higher education, or to secondary specialized schools for profession training in China. The two schools graduated more than 1000 Vietnamese students and closed in 1956 and 1957 respectively (Shi and Zhuang, 1990).

Following development of diplomatic relationship with many African countries at the end of 1950s and the beginning of 1960s, a great number of African students came to China for study. The Chinese Ministry of Education set up a special organization--the Office for Africa Students to deal with all related affairs in the Beijing Institute of Foreign Language in 1960 (Yearbook of Chinese Education 1949-1981, 1984).

In order to improve the TCAFL program as well as the facilities for foreign students, the Ministry of Higher Education established the Preparatory school for Higher Education for Foreign Students in 1962. The school was renamed Beijing Language Institute in 1964 and set up the TCAFL teacher-training program. During 1962 – 1965, the TCAFL programs developed from one university to more than twenty universities and enrolled 3,944 foreign students (Lu, 1989).

Because of Cultural Revolution, the TCAFL programs were completely halted from 1966 to 1972. The TCAFL was in recovery period from 1972 to 1976. Beijing Language Institute was reopened in 1973 and began to enroll foreign students in the same year. From 1973 to 1976, the institute admitted 400 to 500 students each year. Beijing University and Fudan University in Shanghai also reorganized Chinese language courses for foreign students. The foreign students enrollment during 1972-1976 was 2,266 (Yearbook of Chinese Education 1949-1981, 1984).

The Open-door Policy implemented in China in 1979 enabled TCAFL to enter a new developing stage. The following is the main characteristics of this period:

1. Speedy increased student enrolment from over the world.

In the 1950s, most of the foreign students learning Chinese in China came from Communist countries, such as Eastern Europe countries, Vietnam and North Korea. Between the 1960s and early 1970s, students from the Third world accounted for the majority. Since China opened the door to the world in 1977, however, the number of students from Western Europe, North American and Japan has increased significantly.

Between 1950 and 1965, over 7200 students from 60 countries and places came to China, averaging 450 each year. From 1973 to 1976, the figure was around 2000 in all or 500 each year. However, in 1999 only, 44711 foreign students from 164 countries came to China to study. Among them, 71% were

from Asia, 13% from Europe, 11% from North and South America, 3% from Africa, and 2% from Oceania. Five leading countries of foreign students in 1999 were Japan, South Korea, the U.S., Indonesia, and Germany. There were 4,094 U.S. students studying in China in 1999, accounting for No.3, but much fewer than Japan's 12,784 and South Korea's 11,731 (Yearbook of China Education, 2000).

2. Diversity of students Majors.

Before 1977, foreign students came to China only to study Chinese language, except students from African countries also learn engineering courses. Since then, more and more students came to study various specialties, though humanities and social sciences were most popular. In 1999, 36,401 students studied humanities and social sciences. Students studying medical sciences, engineering, arts, natural sciences, agriculture and physical education were 4,973, 1724, 656, 425, 303 and 229 respectively (Yearbook of China Education, 2000).

3. Rapid development of short TCAFL programs.

Approved by the State Education Commission, Beijing Language Institute established the first short term (6 months) Chinese language program in 1978. Thirty French students first enrolled in this program in the summer of 1978. The short TCAFL programs have developed quickly, because the programs satisfy the need of many foreign students wanted to just spend a summer in learning Chinese in China. From 1980 to 1986, the State Education Commission issued many documents to emphasize the development and support of the short term TCAFL programs. Since then, the short team programs developed much faster. In 1999, short team students increased to 15,495, 32 % of the total foreign students of that year (Year Book of China Education, 2000).

4. Establishment of special government agency to lead and coordinate TCAFL.

Under the approval of the State Council, the State TCAFL Leading Group, the highest government agency in Charge of TCAFL, was established in 1987. The State TCAFL Leading Group takes the leading and coordinating responsibility in making plans and policies of TCAFL programs over the country as well as sponsoring important TCAFL teaching and research tasks. The establishment of the State TCAFL Leading Group indicated Chinese government played a more active role in TCAFL.

5. Forming of China TCAFL Education Association.

Before 1983, there was not any academic group or organization of TCAFL in China. The first academic organization in the area of TCFAL is Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language Education Studies Association, which was established in 1983 and was a branch of Chinese Education Association. The association became an independent academic organization in 1988, and changed the name to China Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language Education Association. The association, together with other organizations, has sponsored three national academic symposiums and many other academic meetings. Establishment of China TCAFL Education Association has enhanced the communication among nationwide TCAFL educators, promote the theoretical studies of TCAFL discipline and bring about academic exchange in China and in the world (Lu, 1989).

6. Funding of the World Chinese Education Association and the World Chinese Education Center

The World Chinese Education Association, the first international TCAFL academic organization, was founded in the meeting of the Second International Chinese Education Symposium in Beijing in 1987. The purpose of the association is to promote international exchange and cooperation in areas of TCAFL in the world. The world Chinese Education Association has sponsored six meetings of the Symposium of International Chinese Education. There were 957 members of the World Chinese Education Association in 1999. Among them, 564 members

came from 41 Countries and areas outside of China (Yearbook of China Education, 2000).

In order to improve and further develop the TCAFL discipline and academic change, the World Chinese Education Center was established in Beijing Language Institute in 1989. The World Chinese Education Center is under the leading of the office of the State TCAFL Education Leading Group and Beijing Language Institute. The tasks of the center are mainly: (1) training TCAFL teachers and receiving of TCAFL researchers from both China and the world; (2) organizing HSK (Test of Chinese as a Foreign Language) and issuing the CHS (the Certificate of Chinese Level); (3) Collecting and editing the information and materials related to the teaching and research of TCAFL in both China and the world; (4) arranging editing and publishing TCAFL textbooks and materials.

7. Holding of Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi (HSK).

With the approval of the State Education Commission, Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi (HSK) or Test of Chinese as a Foreign Language (TOCFL), an authoritative test similar in nature to TOEFL, was first to be held on June 15, 1990 in Beijing, Tianjin, Shanghai and Dalian. In 1999, 37 places in China and 34 places in 18 countries held HSK. The examinees of HSK in China were 63,849 and outside of China were 6,833. The total of examinees increased 42% in 1999 than that of 1998 (Yearbook of China Education, 2000).

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the motivation, beliefs and anxiety of American college students studying Chinese in China. The research was carried out in two stages: The data were collected in Beijing, Shanghai, Nanjing and Shuzhou in China, and the analyses and report of the data were completed in the United States afterwards. A non-experimental quantitative approach was used because the research was descriptive by nature. 133 American college students studying Chinese in seven key universities in China were surveyed. The data were processed and analyzed with the help of the Academic Computing Center of the University of Texas at Austin.

Participants

A total of 133 American college students studying Chinese in seven key universities in four large cities in China in the spring and summer semesters, 2000 participated in the survey. According to the Institute of International Education, the total number of American college students who studied in China during 2000/2001 was 2,942 (IIE, 2004) and therefore, the sample of this study is 4.52% of the target population. The investigation focused on the subjects' reasons for learning Chinese, their beliefs about language learning and their foreign language anxiety. The ethnic backgrounds of students were considered in these analyses. Other background variables, including age, gender, majors, educational levels, age of starting to learn Chinese and other foreign languages, years of Chinese and other foreign language study, and travel to foreign countries were also investigated.

The subjects for this study were classified into three groups: (1) Chinese background group, including students with any Chinese family backgrounds from any countries and areas (37 students, 27.8%); (2) Non-Chinese Asian background group, including students with Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese and other Southeast Asian backgrounds (20 students, 15.0%); and (3) Other background group, including 71 White Caucasians, 3 Hispanics and 2 Africa Americans (76 students, 57.1%). The following table shows the students from the three ethnic backgrounds among the seven universities.

University	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total
Non-Asian	18	16	11	9	9	7	6	76
Non-Chinese Asian	4	3	3	5	1	2	2	20
Chinese-background	6	7	5	4	7	4	4	37
Total	28	26	19	18	17	13	12	133

Instruments

Three survey instruments were used in this study: the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI, Horwitz, 1983a, 1987), the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS, Horwitz, 1983b), and a detailed Individual Background Information Questionnaire. Modified versions of the BALLI and the FLCAS were used to facilitate adaptations to the context of learning Chinese in China. Twelve additional items concerning learning Chinese in China were added to the BALLI.

Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) and BALLI Plus

The Beliefs About Language Learning (BALLI) was developed by Horwitz, (1983a, 1987) to assess student opinions on a variety of issues and controversies related to language learning. This 34-item Likert-scale inventory has been used to assess the beliefs of students about language learning in a variety of studies. A slightly adapted foreign language version (Horwitz, 1988) was used for these American college students. According to Horwitz, this survey assesses learner beliefs in five major categories: (1) Foreign language aptitude; (2) The difficulty of language learning; (3) The nature of language learning; (4) Learning and communication strategies: (5) Motivations and expectation. The BALLI has been used to understand the nature of student beliefs and the impact of these beliefs on language learning strategies; to understand why teachers choose particular teaching practice, and to determine where the beliefs of language teachers and their students might be in conflict (Horwitz, 1987).

The modified versions of the BALLI used in this study were based on the ESL vision of the BALLI developed by Horwitz in 1987. The modified BALLI contains the original 34 items and 12 additional items. Some of the original items were technically modified for Chinese learning situation (see Appendix F for these changes). The 12 additional items were especially created in consideration of the characteristics of Chinese language and the situation of studying Chinese in China. This part of the questionnaire was used to investigate the subjects' beliefs about specific features of Chinese language learning and teaching, especially in the target language context, such as which part of Chinese is seen as most difficult part to learn, whether reading and writing are as important as listening and speaking, whether methods of Chinese language teaching are more effective in China than in the U.S., whether learning Chinese in Chinese society is more important and useful than in Chinese classes and whether Chinese programs and Chinese teachers in China are better than those in the U.S. (see Appendix D for the new items).

In Yang's (1992) study of Chinese learners of English in Taiwan, internal consistency as measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient for a sample of 498 subjects was .69. In a study of 197 Korean learners of English in Korea by Truitt, (1995), internal consistency for the Korean BALLI was .61, while another study of Korean learners of English in Korea by Park (1995) yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .61. Kunt's (1997) study of Turkish learners of English in Turkish-Cyprus reported alphas of .64 and .63 on samples of 554 and 328 subjects. In Oh's (1996) study of 195 students learning Japanese in University of Texas at Austin, Cronbach's alpha coefficient for 178 subjects on the BALLI was .54. Cronbach's alpha for the BALLI for 664 Korean English learners in Kim-Yoon's study was .59. In the present study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the BALLI was .70, which is similar to the previous studies. However, the Cronbach's alpha for the BALLI Plus was .75, which is higher than that of the BALLI. The reason might be that the additional 12 items are specially focused on learning Chinese in China.

The reason for low internal consistency on the BALLI might be that it measures students' opinions and perceptions on various dimensions. Although the internal consistency reliability of this inventory was not high, I believe it is still adequate for my research purposes.

Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)

The FLCAS was created by Horwitz (1983b) "to assess the specific anxiety experienced by students in the foreign language classroom. It is a self-report measure that assesses the degree of anxiety, as evidenced by negative performance expectancies and social comparisons, psycho-physiological symptoms, and avoidance behaviors" (Horwitz, 1986 p.559). The FLCAS consists of 33 items answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." For each participant in this study, a composite score was calculated by summing his or her responses to the items. The FLCAS was

developed to test the foreign language anxiety of American college foreign language students, but it has been adapted for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. In Horwitz's study (1986) of 108 college students enrolled in the beginning French and Spanish classes, she found internal consistency of .93, as measured by Cronbach's alpha. Truitt (1995) reported a Cronbach's alpha of .95 based on a sample of 198 Korean EFL students in Korea. Oh's (1996) study of students of Japanese at the University of Texas at Austin reported a Cronbach's alpha of .95. In Yan's (1998) study of 532 Chinese EFL students in a university in China, the Cronbach's alpha on her modified FLCAS (original 34 items plus additional 6 items) was .91. The Cronbach's alpha of the FLCAS in this study was .83, which is lower than that found in previous studies. It might have been influenced by the differences among the subjects' ethnic and cultural backgrounds and the special situation of learning a less commonly taught foreign language in a target language country.

Individual Background Information Questionnaire

A detailed individual background information questionnaire was used to gather general information about the subjects (Appendix B). In addition to basic demographic information, the questionnaire asked about native language, previous foreign language learning experience, goals and interests of learning Chinese, reasons for studying Chinese in China, and previous exposure to Chinese language and culture. The questionnaire also asked about previous experience in traveling abroad, influence of family members and friends on learning Chinese, and learners' perceptions of their language aptitude.

Data Collection

The questionnaire was administered to the 133 American college students, who were studying Chinese in seven key universities in four large cities in China from May to September in 2000. The survey was administered in English and supervised by either the researcher or the instructors of the Chinese classes. A brief description of the present study was presented to the subjects, along with a cover letter that included a consent form to be signed by subjects.

While responding to the questionnaire, the subjects were encouraged to raise any questions about the meaning of the survey statements and to use dictionaries as they wished. In order to avoid possible cross-contamination in their responses, however, the participants were not allowed to discuss their answers with each other.

Data Analysis

Data analysis for this study was carried out on the assumption that the survey instruments were internally consistent and would produce valid data when used with these three ethnic groups of American college students studying Chinese in China.

The procedures and methods of analyzing the collected data are described as follows.

Quantitative Analysis

SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 10.0 for MS Windows was used for the quantitative aspects of this study.

1. Descriptive statistics were used to calculate and summarize the frequencies, means and standard deviations for the BALLI, BALLI Plus, FLCAS and Individual Background Information Questionnaire. Cross-comparisons of the three ethnic student groups and previous studies using the

BALLI and FLCAS were also made.

2. ANOVA (one-way analysis of variance) tests were computed to determine whether significant difference existed among the three ethnic groups and the subgroups. Post-hoc analyses examined which differences were significant for the three ethnic groups and other subgroups.

3. The FLCAS mean scores were computed for the three ethnic groups and the subgroups to examine their levels of foreign language anxiety. The FLCAS mean scores for the three ethnic groups and the subgroups were also compared by ANOVA to find whether significant differences existed among their levels of anxiety. Post-hoc analyses examined which differences were significant for these groups.

4. Principal-component analyses were first performed on the data of the BALLI and the FLCAS respectively to obtain estimates of the initial factors and to determine the number of factors needed to represent the data. The subsequent factor analyses were performed by using principal axial factoring as a method of extraction to identify the main variables from the BALLI and the FLCAS respectively to determine their underlying factors. Four principal-component analyses and subsequently factor analyses were performed in this study. One was performed on the BALLI responses and three on the FLCAS based on the three ethnic groups.

Additional Analyses

1. Cross-comparison analyses were performed with the variables on the Individual Background Information Questionnaire, the BALLI and the FLCAS by descriptive statistics.

2. Cross-comparison analyses were made among the three ethnic background groups with respect to reasons for learning Chinese and studying Chinese in China, goals for learning Chinese and learners' self-assessments of

their own Chinese language level.

3. Comparative analyses of the similarities and differences among the three ethnic background groups with respect to the responses on the BALLI, the BALLI Plus and the FLCAS were conducted.

4. The factors on the BALLI were compared to those from previous studies.

5. Cross-comparison were made with the factors found among the three ethnic groups.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics and Analysis of the Background Variables

The individual background questionnaire provided information on demographics, foreign language learning experience, exposure to Chinese language and culture, purposes and goals in learning Chinese, reasons for studying Chinese in China, and self-assessed levels of Chinese competence. In addition to offering a general description and analysis of the language learners in China, this study investigated the influences of ethnic background on American college students studying Chinese in China.

The sample consisted of 133 participants, with 76 (57.1%) from Group A (Non-Asian background students), 20 (15.0%) from Group B (Non-Chinese Asian background students), and 37 (27.8%) from Group C (Chinese background students). Group A included 72 white (Caucasian), two African American and two Hispanic participants. Group B included students with family backgrounds from Japan, Korea and Southeast Asian countries. Students with Chinese family backgrounds from any countries and areas are included in Group C. Eighty-one percent (108 students) of the participants were native speakers of English, even though the ethnic backgrounds of the subjects were varied. This percentage is high, considering that 42.8% of the subjects have Asian backgrounds (including Chinese backgrounds). Eight students (6%) considered themselves as native speakers of Chinese or Chinese dialects. These students' first language is Chinese or Chinese dialects and they immigrated to the U.S. as young children.

Age, Gender and Educational Background

The range of ages in the sample was 16 to 39, with 75.2% of the subjects aged 18 to 23. Ages 19 and 20 were the most common, with 20.3% and 22.6% of the participants respectively. Among the three groups, the average and range of ages in Group A (Mean age: 22.38; SD: 4.40) was higher than those in Group C (Mean age: 19.32; SD: 1.83) and Group B (Mean age: 20.55; SD: 2.26). One of the main reasons for the difference might be that the students in Group A started to study Chinese later since they had spent time previously studying other foreign languages.

As for gender, there were 80 (60.2%) female students and 53 (39.8%) male students. Group B has the largest difference with male students accounting for 10% of the participants and female students accounting for 90%. Group A and Group C were 42.1% and 51.4% male and 57.9% and 48.6% female, respectively. Group C was the only group with more male students than female students. The influence of Majors or Specialties might be one of the main reasons for this difference.

In both Groups A and B, about half of the students were majoring in the Humanities, East Asian Studies or Chinese (Group A: 55.3% and Group B: 50%). The percentage for these majors was only 21.6% in Group C. Students majoring in Chinese or East Asian Studies, majors which are directly related to Chinese language and culture, are 27.7%, 30% and 21.6% in Group A, B and C respectively. There are much higher rates of Humanities majors in Group A (27.6%) and Group B (20%) than in Group C (5.4%) and most of these majors are female students. Humanities, including Chinese and East Asian Studies, is one of the main areas that female students major in more frequently than male students. This trend is also true for American students studying Chinese in China. An additional phenomenon that is worth noticing is the low rate of majors in Economics/Business in Group A (7.9%), and the relatively high rate in Group B (30.0%) and C (18.9%). Majors in Economics/Business in Group B and C are more than double the number in Group A. Ethnic backgrounds and social

cultural factors might play a role here. With the same or similar ethnic and cultural backgrounds and the rapid development of the Chinese economy, plus the relative ease of mastering the Chinese language, students from Group B and C should have an advantage and better business opportunities than those in Group A. Twenty-five percent of students' majors or specialties in this study were East Asian Studies (19.5%) and Chinese (5.3%). Other popular majors were Humanities, 20%; Economics/Business, 14.3%; Science, 14.3% and Social Sciences, 11.3%.

Regarding education levels, most students (63.9%) were Juniors (24.1%), Seniors (20.3%) and Sophomores (19.5%). Seventy-six percent of the participants were undergraduate students and 16.5% were graduate students. The education level in group A is higher than that in Group B and Group C (Group A Mean: 3.51 years; Group B Mean: 3.05 years and Group C Mean: 3.08 years). Again, it is likely that the education level is higher for Group A since they have already studied other foreign languages.

Chinese Language Learning Experience

Students in these groups started learning Chinese at ages ranging from 1 to 37. However, most students started to learn Chinese between ages 18 and 22 (69.1%) with 18 as the mode (30.8%). The ages of starting to learn Chinese in Group A and Group B are similar with mean ages of 19.43 and 19.40 respectively. These means are approximately 5 years higher than the mean age of 14.5 in Group C. Seventy-eight percent of the participants started to learn Chinese in the U.S. and 16.5% of them started in China or Taiwan. Not surprisingly, among the three groups, the percentage of students starting to learn Chinese in the U.S. in Group A (82.9%) and Group B (95.0%) is much higher than that in Group C (62.2%).

For the question "How many years have you studied Chinese?", 31.1% of participants reported less than one year and 43.6% reported one or two years. The percentage of participants who had studied Chinese for two years or less was 73.7%, and the percentages of those who studied for three or four years or more than five years were 14.3% and 11.3% respectively. Group A and Group B have much rates of studying Chinese for only one or two years than Group C (51.3% and 60.0% versus 18.9%). In contrast, Group C has a higher rate of studying Chinese for more than five years than Group A and Group B (18.9% versus 10.5% and 0.0%). The percentage of students who studied Chinese for less than one year in Group C is over double than that in Group A and Group B (51% versus 22.4% and 20.0%). The higher rate of learning Chinese for less than one year in Group C might be due to the standard of calculation. Some of the students in Group C might only calculate formal Chinese classes in their secondary schools and universities and exclude their informal Chinese learning. False beginners are an important problem in beginning Chinese classes in universities in the U.S. (Linnell, 2001; Guthries, 1985; Christensen and Wu, 1993; He, 1999 and Wang, 1996), which needs to be considered with respect to the results of this study. However, the number of years spent in China among the three groups is quite similar -- 94% of participants had been in China for less than one year.

With respect to the question "How many hours do you study Chinese outside of class per week?", 66.2% of the participants reported 5 to 15 hours, 39.1% reported 5 to 10 hours and 27.1% reported 10 to 15 hours. The participants who spent less than 5 hours, 11 to 15 hours, or more than 20 hours were 15.0%, 11.3% and 7.5% respectively. The number of hours spent studying Chinese outside of class weekly was different for the three groups. Group A has the highest rate for "11 to 15 hours" (39.5%) and "15 to 20 hours" (15.8%), while Group B has the highest rate for "5 to 10 hours" (60.0%) and "more than 20 hours" (15.0%). Group C has the highest rate for "less than 5 hours" (27.0%) and

a much lower rate for "16 to 20 hours" and "more than 20 hours" than Group A and Group B (5.4% versus 23.7% and 25.0%). The results show that the students in Group C spend fewer hours studying Chinese outside of class weekly than those in Group A and Group B.

Other Foreign Language Learning Experience

Interestingly, 86.5% of the participants had studied at least one foreign language in addition to Chinese. More than one third (35.4%) had studied two or more additional foreign languages. Seventy-eight percent of the subjects had studied other foreign languages for three years or more. The percentage of students who had studied other foreign languages in Group A, Group B and Group C were 81.5%, 90.0% and 94.6% respectively. The most popular foreign languages studied were Spanish (37.6%) French (31.6%) and German (9.0%). It should be noted that since very few elementary schools and secondary schools offer Chinese, Japanese, Korean or any Southeast Asian languages, participants in Groups B and C also studied more commonly taught foreign languages.

Most of the students started to study other foreign languages earlier than they started to study Chinese (Mean age: 12.43 versus 19.43). Sixty-three percent of the subjects started to learn other foreign languages between age 11 and age 15, and more than half of them started at the age of 14 or 15. Students in all 3 groups started to study other foreign languages at similar ages (Mean age 12.43, 11.31 and 12.91). However, more than half of the students in Group C started to study other foreign languages at the age of 12 and 13, even though their mean starting age was higher than that of the other two groups.

Participants studied other foreign languages longer than they have studied Chinese. Seventy-eight percent of the participants had studied other foreign languages for three years or more, and most of them (45.1%) had studied another language for more than five years. In contrast, only 25.6% and 11.3% of the

students had studied Chinese for three years or more or more than five years. The average number of years spent studying other foreign language in Group A, Group B and Group C was similar, with mean scores of 3.58, 3.25 and 3.35 years respectively. However, the participants in Group A had a higher rate of studying other foreign languages for more than five years than Group B and Group C (53.9% compared to 30.0% and 35.1%).

Seventy-five percent of the subjects had traveled to other countries before arriving in China. The countries they had visited most were European countries (46.6%). East Asian and Southeast Asian countries were ranked second (11.3%) and third (9.0%) respectively. Most of the subjects had spent less than one year in other foreign countries; nineteen percent of the subjects had lived in foreign countries for more than one year, and 6.8% had lived in another country for more than five years. Subjects in Group C traveled to other countries somewhat less frequently than students in Groups A and B (64.9% versus 76.3% and 75.0%). The students had primarily visited European countries (59.2%) and Southeast Asian countries (9.2%) (Group A), East Asian countries (40%) and Southeast Asian countries (20%) (Group B), and European countries (37.8%) and other countries (13.5%) (foreign countries except European, East Asian and Southeast Asian countries) (Group C).

Goals and Self-Perspectives on Language Learning and Chinese Proficiency

Several questions asked about the students' goals for studying Chinese and their assessment of their language proficiency. 76.7% of the participants reported that they wanted to "become fluent" in listening, speaking, reading and writing Chinese. Group A had a higher rate of only choosing "Speaking and Listening" than Group B and Group C (31.6% versus 15% and 8.1%). In contrast, Group B and Group C had a higher rate of choosing all language skills

(85.0% and 89.2%) than Group A (68.4%). The reason for the high rate of choosing "Both" in Group B might result from their ethnic language backgrounds. Their ethnic languages had used Chinese characters before changing to the current writing system; Vietnamese, Korean, and Japanese still use Chinese characters. Therefore, Chinese characters, which are the main obstacle to reading and writing, may not be so difficult for Group B, especially when compared with Group A. For Group A, speaking and listening may actually be easier than reading and writing, since they can master speaking and listening by using the alphabetic Pinyin system instead of the much more complicated Chinese characters. Mastering Chinese characters means many years of commitment, probably even a lifetime of study for Group A, and they might perceive the task to be too difficult (Ginnis, 1994; Pease, 1996).

For the question "Do you enjoy language learning?", 88.0% of subjects answered "Yes." Group B has the highest rate of enjoying language learning, with 100% versus 85.5% for Group A and 86.5% for Group C. Ninety-two percent of the subjects thought they were good language learners. Group B has the highest positive answers for good language learners (combining "very much," "fairly" and "slightly"), with 100% versus 91.8% for Group C and 89.5% for Group A.

For the question " How do you rate your overall proficiency in the Chinese language as compared with the proficiency of other students in your class?," 64% of the subjects answered with "Excellent" or "Good." Only 6.0% of the subjects chose "Poor." The subjects' answers obviously show that they have optimistic views about their Chinese language proficiency. It is interesting to note that Group A, which does not have a Chinese or Asian background, has the highest rate of "Excellent" answers, with 18% versus 5.0% for Group B and none for the Chinese background students in Group C. The number of students choosing "Poor" in Group A is also lower than in Group C, with 6.6% versus 8.1%. These answers from Group A and Group C demonstrate how cultural backgrounds might influence self-perceptions. East Asian cultures, including

Chinese culture, emphasize the value of personal modesty. On the contrary, Western culture encourages positive self-perceptions. Thus, it is likely that the students in Groups B and C rated their Chinese proficiency low due to cultural modesty.

For the question "How do you rate your overall proficiency in Chinese language as compared with the proficiency of native speakers of Chinese", none of the subjects chose "Excellent." The answers "Good," "Fair" and "Poor" were 5.3%, 26.3% and 68.4% respectively. Group C has the highest rate of choosing "Good" (13.5% versus 2.6% for Group A and none for Group B), while Group A had the highest rate of choosing "Poor" (80.35% versus 75% for Group B and 40.5% for Group C). This result likely indicates that Group A showed optimism and Group C showed pessimism in their self-perceptions in learning Chinese in a classroom. However, when making self-perceptions about Chinese proficiency in the real world, the self-perceptions of both groups seem more pessimistic, since both groups have a quite high rate of choosing "Poor" and a very low rate of choosing "Good" (none of choosing "Excellent").

Reasons for Learning Chinese and Studying Chinese in China

Reasons for Learning Chinese

For the question " Why do you want to learn Chinese?" the questionnaire offered 8 reasons for learning Chinese. The subjects were told to choose any of the reasons that applied to their situations in the order of their importance. They also supplied their own reasons in a free-response format.

Among the 8 reasons for studying Chinese, interest in culture, interest in the language, need for future career goal, family influence, and need for travel were the five most commonly cited factors (ranging from 30.1% to 83.5%). An

Table 5.1 Reasons for Learning Chinese (1)

Reasons	Non-Asian			Non-Chinese Asian			Chinese-background			Total
	%	Mean	SD	%	Mean	SD	%	Mean	SD	
Family influence	14.5%	.1447	.3542	20.0%	.2000	.4104	91.9%	.9189	.2767	36.8%
Friend and relative influence	17.1%	.1711	.3791	25.0%	.2500	.4443	43.2%	.4324	.5022	25.6%
Interest in the language	73.7%	.7368	.4433	100.0%	1.0000	.0000	91.9%	.9189	.2767	82.7%
Interest in culture	82.9%	.8289	.3791	85.0%	.8500	.3663	83.8%	.8378	.3737	83.5%
Required by major	18.4%	.1842	.3902	20.0%	.2000	.4104	13.5%	.1351	.3466	17.3%
Required for an elective	5.3%	.2634	.2248	20.0%	.2000	.4104	8.1%	.108E-02	.2767	8.3%
Need for future career	53.9%	.5395	.5018	40.0%	.4000	.5026	43.2%	.4324	.5022	48.9%
Need for travel	28.9%	.2895	.4565	35.0%	.3500	.4894	29.7%	.2973	.4634	30.1%
Other	10.5%	.1053	.3089	25.0%	.2500	.4443	13.5%	.1351	.3466	13.5%

Table 5.2 Reasons for Learning Chinese (2)

Reasons	Non-Asian		Non-Chinese Asian		Chinese Background		Total	
	(1)*	(2)*	(1)*	(2)*	(1)*	(2)*	(1)*	(2)*
Family influence	9.2%	3.0%	20.0%		75.7%	2.7%	29.3%	2.5%
Friend and relative influence	10.5%	3.0%	5.0%	16.7%	2.7%	29.7%	7.5%	13.2%
Interest in the language	35.5%	36.4%	55.0%	22.2%	16.2%	45.9%	33.1%	37.2%
Interest in culture	30.3%	37.9%		50.0%		18.9%	17.3%	33.9%
Required by major	2.6%	6.1%		11.1%			1.5%	5.0%
Required for an elective		3.0%						1.7%
Need for future career	7.9%	9.1%	10.0%		5.4%	2.7%	7.5%	5.8%
Other	3.9%	1.5%	10.0%				3.8%	.8%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*** (1)=Fist Choice; (2)=Second choice.**

overwhelming majority of the subjects chose interest in culture (83.5%) and interest in the language (82.7%). The percentage of participants choosing future career goal, family influence and travel were 48.9%, 36.8% and 30.1% respectively.

There are few differences among the groups with respect to interest in culture (82.9%, 85.0% and 83.8%), "future career goal" (53.9%, 40.0% and 43.2%) and travel (28.9%, 35.0% and 29.7%). However, there are some important differences with respect to family influence and interest in the language, especially the former. Ninety-two percent of the subjects in Group C chos family influence versus only 14.5% for Group A and 20% for Group B. Group B and Group C endorsed interest in the language more strongly (100% and 91.9%) than Group A (73.7%). Interestingly, the rank of the five most important factors among the three groups also displays some noticeable differences. For Group A and Group B, the Number 1 choice was interest in culture and interest in the language respectively. However, the first choice for Group C was family influence (91.9%), which did not even appear among the five most important factors for Group A and Group B. Another important difference is that Group A and Group B are more concerned about learning Chinese for their future careers (Group A and Group B ranked it as the third factor and Group C ranked it as five).

There are some other differences that deserve notice. The influence of friends and relatives was ranked third by both Group A and Group B and as fourth by Group C, though it did not rank among the five most important factors for the whole group. Group C has a much higher rate for this factor than the other two groups (43.2% versus 25.0% for Group B and 17.1% for Group A). Group B also has a much higher rate for required to take as an elective to graduate than Group A and Group C (20.0% versus 5.3% and 8.1%).

The following table shows the orders of the five most important factors for the three groups, based on the total number of choices for each factor.

Table 5.3 Orders of the Five Most Important Factors among the three groups for Learning Chinese

Order	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	Chinese background
(1)	Interest in culture	Interest in the language	Family influence
(2)	Interest in the language	Interest in culture	Interest in the language
(3)	Need for future career	Need for future career	Interest in culture
(4)	Need for travel	Need for travel	Friend and relative influence
(5)	Friend and relative influence	Friend and relative influence	Need for future career

In order to further explore the intensity of the factors that influence motivation for learning Chinese, a descriptive analysis of the first and second choices was performed, and results are very interesting (see table 5.2 (2)) For example, all three groups have a similar high rate of total choices for interest in culture (82.9%, 85.0% and 83.8% for Group A, Group B and Group C respectively); however, there is a great difference among them based on the rank of the choices. 30.3% of Group A ranked interest in culture first while no one did so in either Group B or C. If the first and second choices were put together, the rates of choosing interest in culture for Group A, Group B and Group C were 63.2%, 45% and 18.9% respectively. Thus, the data show clearly that Group A has a much stronger motivation for learning Chinese because of their interest in culture than the other two groups. While interest in culture is the most important source of motivation for Group A, interest in the language and family influence are the most important sources for Group B and Group C respectively (55.0% of Group B chose Interest in the language as number 1 factor) and Group C (75% of Group C chose Family influence as number 1 factor).

It is surprising that the percentage of instrumental motivation categories (future career, major requirement, and required elective) is quite low for all three

groups, especially as first or second choices. The first and second choices for own future career, major requirement, and required elective were 15.8%, 7.9% and 2.6% respectively for Group A, 10.0%, 10.0% and 0% for Group B, and 8.1%, 0% and 0% for Group C.

Reasons for Studying Chinese in China

Six reasons were listed for the question " Why did you choose to study Chinese in China?" For this question, the subjects were asked to choose any of the reasons that applied to their situations, rank their importance, and add any additional reasons that were not listed.

An overwhelming majority of the subjects ranked more effective, more interesting, and more authentic environment as the three most important factors for going to China. The total choices of more effective, more interesting and an authentic

Table 5.4 Reasons for Studying Chinese in China (1)

Reasons for study	Non-Asian			Non-Chinese Asian			Chinese-background			Total
in China	%	Mean	SD	%	Mean	SD	%	Mean	SD	
More interesting	64.5%	.6447	.4818	90.0%	.9000	.3078	73.0%	.7297	.4502	70.7%
More effective	85.5%	.8553	.3542	90.0%	.9000	.3078	75.7%	.7568	.4350	83.5%
Authentic environment	65.8%	.6579	.4776	60.0%	.6000	.5026	89.2%	.8919	.3148	71.4%
Important for future career	56.6%	.5658	.4989	25.0%	.2500	.4443	24.3%	.2432	.4350	42.9%
Parents' requirement		.0000	.0000	5.0%	5.000E-02	.2236	10.8%	.1081	.3148	3.8%
Friends' influence	3.9%	3.947E-02	.1960	15.0%	.1500	.3663	16.2%	.1622	.3737	9.0%
Other	10.5%	.1053	.3089	15.0%	.1500	.3663	8.1%	8.108E-02	.2767	10.5%

Table 5.5 Reasons for Studying Chinese in China (2)

Reasons for Studying in China	Non-Asian		Non-Chinese Asian		Chinese Background		Total	
	(1)*	(2)*	(1)*	(2)*	(1)*	(2)*	(1)*	(2)*
More interesting	44.7%	15.6%	65.0%	11.1%	54.1%	6.1%	50.4%	12.2%
More effective	36.8%	54.7%	25.0%	50.0%	35.1%	45.5%	34.6%	51.3%
Authentic environment	10.5%	17.2%		27.8%	2.7%	39.4%	6.8%	25.2%
Important experience for future career	6.6%	12.5%	10.0%			3.0%	5.3%	7.8%
Parents' requirement					2.7%	6.1%	.8%	1.7%
Other	1.3%			11.1%	5.4%		2.3%	1.7%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*** (1)=Fist Choice, (2)=Second choice.**

environment were 70.7%, 85% and 71.4% respectively. Future career was ranked 4th (43.0%) whereas influence of friends and parents' requirement were only endorsed by 15% and 5% of the participants.

Although the three ethnic groups chose the same three main factors for going China to study Chinese, there is a difference in the order. The authentic learning environment was ranked first by Group C (89.2%), but third by Group A (56.6%) and Group B (60.0%). More effective was ranked first by Group A (88.2%) and Group B (tying with more interesting, 90.0%) and second by Group C (75.1%). More interesting was ranked first by Group B (tying with more effective, 90.0%) and second by Group A (72.3%) and third by Group C (73.0%). Group A has a much higher rate of choosing important experience for future career (56.6%) than Group B (35.0%) and Group C (24.3%). Group B and Group C have a much higher rate of choosing influence of friends (15.0% and 16.2%) than Group A (3.9%). Group A is the only group that did not list parents' requirement as a choice.

The data above manifest a different emphasis for studying Chinese in China among the three groups. Group C has a much higher rate of choosing an authentic learning environment likely because the authentic environment is more

important for them, since they are expected to speak and act like Chinese. They already have a good environment for learning Chinese in the U. S., but they need an authentic Chinese environment to further polish and develop their knowledge and skills. The reason for Group B having the highest rate of choosing both more interesting and more effective is likely because their ethnic languages and cultures made them feel relatively comfortable in China. They were also the most satisfied with the Chinese programs in China. Because of different ethnic languages and cultures, Group A experienced the most difficulty learning Chinese in the U.S. Therefore, they desired an effective Chinese learning environment and expected that they could learn Chinese more effectively in China than that in the U.S. Group A has a much higher rate of choosing important experience for future career than the other two groups. They likely thought that there was an advantage for their future careers if they had experience in China and could speak Chinese, since few people with Non-Asian backgrounds had such an experience. For Group C, there is no such advantage, since almost every one with a Chinese background can speak Chinese. Conversely, there would be a disadvantage for them if they could not speak Chinese, since they are expected to be able to speak at least some Chinese. For Group B, there is not much advantage to studying in China, since they look "Chinese". It is not surprising that no one in Group A chose parents' requirement and only a very low percentage of them chose influence of friends, since their families are of different ethnic backgrounds and they have very few if any friends who speak or study Chinese.

Analysis of Variance of Three Ethnic Groups

ANOVA was conducted to check if there were significant differences among the three ethnic groups on background variables, reasons for Chinese study, BALLI factors and FLCAS scores.

ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Age, Gender, Native Language and Educational level and Major

As can be seen in Table 5.6, a one-way ANOVA test shows that a significant difference exists among the ethnic groups for Age (F=9.504, p<. 001), Gender (F=5.078, p< .05), Native Language (F=30.764, p< .001), and Major (F=3.444, p< .05), but not for Educational Level.

In order to examine the specific differences, post-hoc multiple comparison tests (Tukey's HSD) were performed. The results are outlined in Table 5.7. Tukey's HSD for Age shows that the students in Group A (Non-Asian group) are older than those in Group B (Non-Chinese Asian) (p< .05) and Group C (Chinese background) (p< .001). The result of the comparison for

Table 5.6 ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Age, Gender, Native Language, Educational and Major

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	**Between Groups**	**244.316**	**2**	**122.158**	**9.504**	**.000**
	Within Groups	**1670.992**	**130**	**12.854**		
	Total	**1915.308**	**132**			
Gender	**Between Groups**	**2.310**	**2**	**1.155**	**5.078**	**.008**
	Within Groups	**29.570**	**130**	**.227**		
	Total	**31.880**	**132**			
Native Language	**Between Groups**	**119.122**	**2**	**59.561**	**30.764**	**.000**
	Within Groups	**251.690**	**130**	**1.936**		
	Total	**370.812**	**132**			
Educational Level	**Between Groups**	**6.404**	**2**	**3.202**	**1.515**	**.224**
	Within Groups	**274.694**	**130**	**2.113**		
	Total	**281.098**	**132**			
Major	**Between Groups**	**40.746**	**2**	**20.373**	**3.444**	**.035**
	Within Groups	**757.254**	**128**	**5.916**		
	Total	**798.000**	**130**			

Table 5.7 Post-hoc Multiple Comparisons of Ethnic Groups by Age, Gender, Native Language, Educational level and Major

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Age	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	1.83	.90	.104
		Chinese-background	3.06*	.72	.000
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	-1.83	.90	.104
		Chinese-background	1.23	1.00	.434
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	-3.06*	.72	.000
		Non-Chinese Asian	-1.23	1.00	.434
Gender	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	.3211*	.1199	.020
		Chinese-background	-9.2461E-02	9.561E-02	.598
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	-.3211*	.1199	.020
		Chinese-background	-.4135*	.1324	.005
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	9.246E-02	9.561E-02	.598
		Non-Chinese Asian	.4135*	.1324	.005
Native Language	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	-2.74*	.35	.000
		Chinese-background	-.47	.28	.218
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	2.74*	.35	.000
		Chinese-background	2.27*	.39	.000
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	.47	.28	.218
		Non-Chinese Asian	-2.27*	.39	.000
Educational Level	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	.46	.37	.413
		Chinese-background	.43	.29	.299
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	-.46	.37	.413
		Chinese-background	-3.11E-02	.40	.997
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	-.43	.29	.299
		Non-Chinese Asian	3.11E-02	.40	.997
Major	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	-.66	.61	.529
		Chinese-background	-1.27*	.49	.026
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	.66	.61	.529
		Chinese-background	-.61	.68	.637
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	1.27*	.49	.026
		Non-Chinese Asian	.61	.68	.637

*** The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.**

Gender shows that the students in Group B are significantly different from those in Group A ($p < .05$) and Group C ($p < .01$). Females predominate in Group B and males predominate in Groups A and Group C. For Native Language, Tukey's HSD indicates that Group B is significantly different from Group A ($p < .001$) and Group C ($p < .001$) (35.0% native English speakers versus 94.7% and 78.4%). For Major, there is a significant difference at the $p < .05$ level between Group A and Group C (the main differences: Humanities: 27.6% versus 54%; Medical Sciences: 1.3% versus 13.5%; 10.5% Sciences: 10.5% versus 27.0%; Economics, Business: 7.9% versus 18.9% and East Asian Studies, including Chinese: 27.7% versus 16.2%).

ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Chinese Language Learning Experience

A one-way ANOVA test on the three ethnic groups by Chinese language learning experience shows that a significant difference exists among them for the

Table 5.8 ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Chinese Language Learning Experience

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age of starting to learn Chinese	Between Groups	628.466	2	314.233	15.364	.000
	Within Groups	2638.443	129	20.453		
	Total	3266.909	131			
Years learning Chinese	Between Groups	1.090	2	.545	.599	.551
	Within Groups	117.297	129	.909		
	Total	118.386	131			
Studying Chinese outside class	Between Groups	20.058	2	10.029	9.149	.000
	Within Groups	142.513	130	1.096		
	Total	162.571	132			

Table 5.9 Post-hoc Multiple Comparisons of Ethnic Groups by Chinese Language Learning Experience

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Age of starting to learn Chinese	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	3.42E-02	1.14	1.000
		Chinese-background	4.91*	.92	.000
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	-3.42E-02	1.14	1.000
		Chinese-background	4.87*	1.26	.000
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	-4.91*	.92	.000
		Non-Chinese Asian	-4.87*	1.26	.000
Years learning Chinese	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	.14	.24	.818
		Chinese-background	.20	.19	.553
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	-.14	.24	.818
		Chinese-background	5.56E-02	.27	.976
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	-.20	.19	.553
		Non-Chinese Asian	-5.56E-02	.27	.976
Studying Chinese outside class	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	1.58E-02	.26	.998
		Chinese-background	.87*	.21	.000
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	-1.58E-02	.26	.998
		Chinese-background	.85*	.29	.009
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	-.87*	.21	.000
		Non-Chinese Asian	-.85*	.29	.009

*** The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.**

age of starting to learn Chinese (F=15.364, p<. 001) and the hours spent studying Chinese outside class (F=9.149, p<. 001), but not for the years spent learning Chinese (Table 5.8).

Post-hoc multiple comparison tests (Tukey's HSD) were performed to determine the specific results. Table 5.9 shows these results. Tukey's HSD indicates that the participants in Group C started learning Chinese significantly earlier than those in Group A (p< .001) and Group B (p< .001). Group C also spent significantly less time learning Chinese outside the classroom than both

Group A ($p < .001$) and Group B ($p < .05$). There was no significant difference between Group A and B for Chinese learning experience.

ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Other Foreign Language Learning Experience

Table 5.10 shows that the ANOVA concerning other foreign language learning experience among the three ethnic groups and finds no significant difference for the age of starting to learn other foreign languages and years in learning other languages. However, there is a significant difference in the particular Other languages studied ($F=5.716$, $p < .05$). Tukey's HSD indicates that Group B displays a significant difference for Other languages studied from both Group A ($p < .05$) and Group C ($p < .05$) (20% for Japanese, 10% for Korean and

Table 5.10 ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Other Foreign Language Learning Experience

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age of starting to learn other languages	Between Groups	27.846	2	13.923	1.081	.343
	Within Groups	1391.091	108	12.880		
	Total	1418.937	110			
Studied other languages?	Between Groups	.812	2	.406	1.145	.321
	Within Groups	46.105	130	.355		
	Total	46.917	132			
Years in learning other languages	Between Groups	1.996	2	.998	2.598	.079
	Within Groups	41.861	109	.384		
	Total	43.857	111			
Which other languages Studied?	Between Groups	68.590	2	34.295	5.716	.004
	Within Groups	671.932	112	5.999		
	Total	740.522	114			

Table 5.11 Post-hoc Multiple Comparisons of Ethnic Groups by Other Foreign Language Learning Experience

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Age of starting to learn other languages	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	1.11	1.01	.513
		Chinese-background	-.49	.77	.803
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	-1.11	1.01	.513
		Chinese-background	-1.60	1.09	.309
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	.49	.77	.803
		Non-Chinese Asian	1.60	1.09	.309
Studied other languages?	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	-.16	.15	.542
		Chinese-background	9.21E-02	.12	.721
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	.16	.15	.542
		Chinese-background	.25	.17	.285
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	-9.21E-02	.12	.721
		Non-Chinese Asian	-.25	.17	.285
Years in learning other language	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	.33	.17	.143
		Chinese-background	.23	.13	.202
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	-.33	.17	.143
		Chinese-background	-.10	.19	.848
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	-.23	.13	.202
		Non-Chinese Asian	.10	.19	.848
Which other languages studied?	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	-2.22*	.66	.003
		Chinese-background	-.46	.52	.647
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	2.22*	.66	.003
		Chinese-background	1.76*	.71	.039
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	.46	.52	.647
		Non-Chinese Asian	-1.76*	.71	.039

*** The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.**

5% for other languages for Group B versus none for Japanese and Korean and 1.3% of other languages for Group A and none of Japanese, Korean and other foreign languages for Group C).

ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Goals for Learning Chinese, Enjoyment of Chinese Learning and Self-Perspectives on Chinese Proficiency

As can be seen in Table 5.12, the ANOVA shows no significant difference among the three ethnic groups for Goals for learning Chinese, Enjoyment of Chinese learning and Self-perspectives on Chinese proficiency in class. A significant difference is only found on Self-perspectives on Chinese proficiency compared with natives (F=11.392, p< .001). Tukey's HSD indicates that there are significant differences for Self-perspectives on Chinese proficiency compared with natives between Group C and both Groups A (p< .001) and B (p< .005) (45.5% choosing "poor" for Group C versus 80.35% for Group A and 75% for Group B).

Table 5.12 ANOVA of Ethnic Groups by Goals for Learning Chinese, Enjoyment of Chinese Learning and Self-Perspectives on Chinese Proficiency

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Goals for learning Chinese	Between Groups	1.005	2	.503	2.583	.079
	Within Groups	25.295	130	.195		
	Total	26.301	132			
Enjoyment of Chinese learning	Between Groups	.252	2	.126	1.400	.250
	Within Groups	11.448	127	9.014E-02		
	Total	11.700	129			
Chinese proficiency in the class	Between Groups	1.141	2	.571	1.019	.364
	Within Groups	72.828	130	.560		
	Total	73.970	132			
Chinese proficiency compared with natives	Between Groups	6.703	2	3.351	11.392	.000
	Within Groups	38.245	130	.294		
	Total	44.947	132			

Table 5.13 Post-hoc Multiple Comparisons of Ethnic Groups by Goals for Learning Chinese, Enjoyment of Chinese Learning and Self-Perspectives on Chinese Proficiency

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Goal for learning Chinese	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	-.17	.11	.293
		Chinese-background	-.18	8.84E-02	.102
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	.17	.11	.293
		Chinese-background	-1.49E-02	.12	.992
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	.18	8.84E-02	.102
		Non-Chinese Asian	1.49E-02	.12	.992
Enjoyment of Chinese learning	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	-.11	7.58E-02	.317
		Chinese-background	2.55E-02	6.06E-02	.907
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	.11	7.58E-02	.317
		Chinese-background	.14	8.33E-02	.236
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	-2.55E-02	6.06E-02	.907
		Non-Chinese Asian	-.14	8.33E-02	.236
Chinese proficiency in the class	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	-.13	.19	.780
		Chinese-background	-.21	.15	.345
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	.13	.19	.780
		Chinese-background	-8.24E-02	.21	.917
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	.21	.15	.345
		Non-Chinese Asian	8.24E-02	.21	.917
Chinese proficiency compared with natives	Non-Asian	Non-Chinese Asian	2.63E-02	.14	.980
		Chinese-background	.51*	.11	.000
	Non-Chinese Asian	Non-Asian	-2.63E-02	.14	.980
		Chinese-background	.48*	.15	.004
	Chinese-background	Non-Asian	-.51*	.11	.000
		Non-Chinese Asian	-.48*	.15	.004

***** The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Descriptive Analysis of the BALLI

Descriptive statistics were computed for the BALLI and the BALLI Plus items. The subjects' responses on the BALLI and the BALLI Plus were grouped into seven major categories. Five of them came from Horwitz' original categories (1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1999), including The Difficulty of Language Learning, Foreign Language Aptitude, The Nature of Language Learning, Learning and Communication Strategy and Motivation and Expectation. Because the BALLI was designed for American students learning foreign languages in the U.S., there are no specific items concerning learning a less commonly taught foreign language abroad. In order to study the language learning beliefs of American college students learning Chinese in China, two additional areas, Perspectives on Learning Chinese and Views and Evaluations of Learning Chinese in China, were added to form the BALLI Plus. The BALLI Plus differs from BALLI only by virtue of the additional 12 questions about several specific features of learning Chinese and studying Chinese in China. These 12 items were added to the end of the original BALLI..

For clarity, in the following description and analysis, strongly agree and agree and strongly disagree and disagree are grouped together except where necessary for discussion.

The Difficulty of Language Learning

The difficulty of Language Learning category consisted of Items 3, 4, 5, 15, 25, and 34. Responses to these items by three ethnic groups are reported in Table 5.14.

Eighty-eight percent of the subjects from all three ethnic groups endorsed Item 3 (" Some languages are easier to learn than others"). Agreement

for Group A Group B and Group C was 89.5%, 80.0% and 88.6%, respectively. Both Group A and Group C believe this more strongly than Group B, with a rate

Table 5.14 The Difficulty of Language Learning

Item	Group	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
B3	Non-Asian	59.2%	30.3%	6.6%	1.3%	2.6%	1.53	1.00
	Non-Chinese Asian	35.0%	45.0%	15.0%	5.0%		1.90	.85
	Chinese-background	48.6%	40.5%	5.4%	2.7%	2.7%	1.70	.91
Total		52.6%	35.3%	7.5%	2.3%	2.3%	1.66	.89
B4	Non-Asian	31.6%	46.1%	18.4%	2.6%	1.3%	1.96	.86
	Non-Chinese Asian	10.0%	65.0%	25.0%			2.15	.59
	Chinese-background	29.7%	64.9%	5.4%			1.76	.55
Total		27.8%	54.1%	15.8%	1.5%	.8%	1.93	.75
B5	Non-Asian	18.4%	50.0%	23.7%	7.9%		2.21	.84
	Non-Chinese Asian	50.0%	25.0%	10.0%	15.0%		1.90	1.12
	Chinese-background	32.4%	48.6%	10.8%	8.1%		1.95	.88
Total		27.1%	45.9%	18.0%	9.0%		2.09	.90
B15	Non-Asian		8.0%	24.0%	44.0%	24.0%	3.84	.89
	Non-Chinese Asian		20.0%	25.0%	20.0%	35.0%	3.70	1.17
	Chinese-background	5.4%	16.2%	27.0%	35.1%	16.2%	3.41	1.12
Total		1.5%	12.1%	25.0%	37.9%	23.5%	3.70	1.01
B25	Non-Asian	1.3%	22.4%	15.8%	42.1%	18.4%	3.54	1.08
	Non-Chinese Asian	10.0%	15.0%	35.0%	35.0%	5.0%	3.10	1.07
	Chinese-background	2.9%	8.6%	20.0%	42.9%	25.7%	3.80	1.02
Total		3.1%	17.6%	19.8%	41.2%	18.3%	3.54	1.08
B34	Non-Asian	11.8%	18.4%	17.1%	32.9%	19.7%	3.30	1.31
	Non-Chinese Asian	25.0%	10.0%	30.0%	30.0%	5.0%	2.80	1.28
	Chinese-background	2.7%	10.8%	21.6%	35.1%	29.7%	3.78	1.08
Total		11.3%	15.0%	20.3%	33.1%	20.3%	3.36	1.28

of strong agreement of 59.2% and 48.6% versus 35%. The endorsement in this study is similar to several previous studies of American students learning German, French, Spanish and Japanese in the U. S. (Horwitz, 1988; Kern, 1995; and Oh, 1996), but it is much lower than that of several EFL studies in Taiwan, Turkish-

Cyprus and Korea (Yang, 1992; Kunt, 1997; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995 and Kim-Yoon, 2000). It is possible that American foreign language learners have more contact with or have studied more foreign languages than EFL learners, who study English almost exclusively. The very high rate of previous foreign language learning experience among the three groups in this study also supports this explanation.

Eighty-two percent of the subjects in this study thought that Chinese was a very difficult or difficult language (27.8% and 54.1%), with Group A showing 77.7%, Group B 75.0% and Group C 94.6%. The number of respondents choosing "a very difficult or difficult language" in this study is much higher than all the studies mentioned above. The unique characteristics of the Chinese language and the special learning and instructional environment in China are a possible explanation. For most English speakers, Chinese is more difficult than Western foreign languages, especially with regard to Chinese characters, the writing system and the many different dialects heard in China. The emphasis on learning Chinese_characters and the writing system and traditional grammar-translation teaching methods in China can make learners feel frustrated and make slow progress.

Among the three groups, Group B has a much lower rate of choosing "very difficult", with 10.0% compared with 31.6% in Group A and 29.7% in Group C. Compared with the other two groups, Group B feels that Chinese is not so difficult to learn. This finding might result from their relatively similar ethnic languages and cultures as well as their much lower proportion of native English speakers, and their high rate of previously studying Japanese and Korean. Another unusual phenomenon is that Group C has a very high rate (94%) of thinking that Chinese is a difficult language, nearly 20% higher than Group A and Group B. It is possible that the standard for learning Chinese is different among the three groups. For Group C, learning Chinese is not only learning how to listen and speak but also how to read and write. It is much more difficult to learn

reading and writing than listening and speaking because of the complicated Chinese characters and writing system. It takes a Chinese child in China about six years in school to learn how to read and write. For Group A and Group B, the main goal for learning Chinese is to learn listening and speaking, and therefore, reading and writing is not so important to them (see also the above descriptive statistics of goals for Chinese learning).

Although a high percentage of the subjects think Chinese is difficult, a majority of each group (from 68.4% to 75.0%) still agreed with Item 5 ("I believe that I will ultimately learn to speak this language very well"), which is higher than most previous studies mentioned above, including both the American students and EFL students. Once again, Group B shows more confidence in this belief than Group A and Group C, with a strong agreement rate of 50.0% versus 18.4% and 32.4%.

In response to Item 15 ("If someone spent one hour a day learning a language, how long would it take them to speak the language well?"), 13.6% of the subjects chose "less than a year" or "1-2 years," which is much lower than the percentages of American students studying German, French and Spanish (42% to 44% choosing "less than a year" or "1-2 years") in Horwitz' study (1988) or EFL students (38% to 39% choosing "1-2 yeas" only) in Yang's (1992) and Kunt's (1997) studies. The percentage of the subjects choosing "5-10 years" and " You cannot learn a language in one hour a day" in the present study were 37.9% and 23.5% respectively, which are higher than the percentages of American students of German, French and Spanish, with 7% to 10% and 8% to 12% respectively (Horwitz, 1988). These numbers are also quite different from the American students of Japanese in Oh's study (1996), where most students chose 3-5 years (43% to 50%), even though both Chinese and Japanese are less commonly taught foreign languages. Contrary to the optimism on language learning showed in these previous studies (Horwitz, 1999), the subjects' answers on the time requirements for language learning in this study seem more practical, even a little

pessimistic. There might be two reasons for this finding. One is the complicated Chinese language system, and the other is the influence of Chinese culture, education system and Chinese traditional teaching methods. The emphasis on reading and writing, literature and character development as well as the teacher-centeredness and textbook-centeredness that might make students feel that they cannot make progress as fast as they previously expected.

For Item 34 (" It is easier to read and write Chinese than to speak and understand it"), Group B shows a lower rate of disagreement than Group A or Group C (35.5% versus 52.6% and 50.3%). The rate of strong disagreement for Group B is also especially low (5.0% versus 19.7% for Group A and 20.3% for Group C). The reason for the difference between Group B and Group A here is likely because of their ethnic backgrounds. Compared with Group A, Group B has a similar ethnic language writing system, which shares some Chinese writing system, particularly Chinese characters used either in the history or present. This similarity could make Group B feel that it is relatively easier to read and write Chinese than to speak and understand it. They may feel that it is difficult to speak and understand not only because of the complex meaning of Chinese characters and associated Chinese culture but also because of the completely different pronunciation system. The different pronunciation and meaning of the same characters from their ethnic languages could interfere and mislead their speaking and understanding. The difference between Group B and Group C is more complicated. The subjects of group C grew up in a Chinese environment including culture (families and communities). It is much easier for them to speak and understand Chinese than to read or write it, since their parents and grandparents speak Chinese at home and force them to listen to Chinese. Therefore, it is relatively easy for them to speak and understand Chinese. However, if they want to read and write it well, they will have to learn the Chinese writing system.

Foreign Language Aptitude

There are 9 items (Items 1, 2, 10, 11, 16, 19, 30, and 33) in the BALLI related to Foreign Language Aptitude. A majority of the subjects (ranging from 56.4% to 89.5%) agreed with 4 statements (Items 1, 2, 10, and 33), disagreed with 2 statements (Items 11, and 19) and were neutral on three statements (Items 6, 16 and 30)

Among the four items students agreed with, only Item 1 ("It is easier for children than adults to learn a foreign language" and Item 2 ("Some people have a special ability for learning foreign languages") have overwhelmingly high agreement rates (89.5% and 86.5%). These rates are similar to American students learning other foreign languages (86% to 90%) (Horwitz, 1988; Kern, 1995 and Oh 1996) and higher than EFL students (63% to 72%) (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kunt, 1997). Among the three groups in this study, Group C has the highest rate of agreement on both Items 1 (97.3%) and 2 (89.2%), while Group B has the lowest rate on both item 1 (75.0%) and 2 (75.0%) with Group A in the middle (89.6% and 86.5%). The higher rate of agreement on Items 1 and 2 in Group A and Group C might be related to their earlier foreign language learning experiences. The percentage of the subjects who started learning foreign languages before 14 years old in Group A (37.9%) and Group C (62.1%) is much higher than in Group B (20%). Because of early rich foreign language learning experiences, they may have more knowledge and experience to compare their current experience with.

Fifty-six percent of the subjects agreed with Item 10 ("It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one"). Among them, Group A has the highest rate of agreement (65.8% versus 50.0% for Group B and 40.5% for Group C), while Group C has the highest rate of

Table 5.15 Foreign Language Aptitude

Item	Group	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
B1	Non-Asian	68.4%	21.1%	5.3%		5.3%	1.53	1.00
	Non-Chinese Asian	50.0%	25.0%	15.0%	10.0%		1.85	1.04
	Chinese-background	59.5%	37.8%			2.7%	1.49	.77
Total		63.2%	26.3%	5.3%	1.5%	3.8%	1.56	.95
B2	Non-Asian	43.4%	44.7%	6.6%		5.3%	1.79	.97
	Non-Chinese Asian	30.0%	45.0%	15.0%	10.0%		2.05	.94
	Chinese-background	35.1%	54.1%	8.1%		2.7%	1.81	.81
Total		39.1%	47.4%	8.3%	1.5%	3.8%	1.83	.92
B6	Non-Asian		7.9%	44.7%	35.5%	11.8%	3.51	.81
	Non-Chinese Asian		10.0%	75.0%	15.0%		3.05	.51
	Chinese-background	2.7%	16.2%	59.5%	18.9%	2.7%	3.03	.76
Total		.8%	10.5%	53.4%	27.8%	7.5%	3.31	.79
B10	Non-Asian	23.7%	42.1%	23.7%	9.2%	1.3%	2.22	.96
	Non-Chinese Asian	10.0%	40.0%	35.0%	15.0%		2.55	.89
	Chinese-background		40.5%	29.7%	21.6%	8.1%	2.97	.99
Total		15.0%	41.4%	27.1%	13.5%	3.0%	2.48	1.00
B11	Non-Asian		35.5%	31.6%	32.9%	100.0%	3.97	.83
	Non-Chinese Asian	5.0%	25.0%	30.0%	40.0%	100.0%	4.05	.94
	Chinese-background		16.2%	37.8%	45.9%	100.0%	4.30	.74
Total		.8%	28.6%	33.1%	37.6%	100.0%	4.08	.83
B16	Non-Asian	5.3%	18.4%	40.8%	31.6%	3.9%	3.11	.93
	Non-Chinese Asian	5.0%	25.0%	30.0%	40.0%		3.05	.94
	Chinese-background		13.5%	54.1%	32.4%		3.19	.66
Total		3.8%	18.0%	42.9%	33.1%	2.3%	3.12	.86
B19	Non-Asian	1.3%	9.2%	46.1%	23.7%	19.7%	3.51	.96
	Non-Chinese Asian		5.0%	25.0%	50.0%	20.0%	3.85	.81
	Chinese-background			40.5%	37.8%	21.6%	3.81	.78
Total		.8%	6.0%	41.4%	31.6%	20.3%	3.65	.90
B30	Non-Asian	1.3%	23.7%	60.5%	14.5%		2.88	.65
	Non-Chinese Asian		5.0%	90.0%	5.0%		3.00	.32
	Chinese-background		24.3%	59.5%	10.8%	5.4%	2.97	.76
Total		.8%	21.1%	64.7%	12.0%	1.5%	2.92	.65
B33	Non-Asian	21.1%	35.5%	27.6%	11.8%	3.9%	2.42	1.07
	Non-Chinese Asian	30.0%	40.0%	25.0%	5.0%		2.05	.89
	Chinese-background	24.3%	51.4%	18.9%	5.4%		2.05	.81
Total		23.3%	40.6%	24.8%	9.0%	2.3%	2.26	.99

disagreement (29.7% versus 10.5% for group A and 15.0% for Group B). The rates of agreement for Group B and Group C are also much lower than those in Horwitz's (1988) study on American students leaning Spanish (89%), French (75%) and German (60%). The difference between Group B and C (especially Group C) and Group A and the other groups in Horwitz's study might result from their different ethnic language backgrounds. The majority of the ethnic backgrounds of Group A and the other groups in Horwitz's study are white and hispanic. Their ethnic languages are similar to one another in many ways. Their cultures are similar to one another as well, especially when compared with East Asian cultures (Chang, 1997). Thus, their ethnic language and culture experiences likely make students in these groups agree with Item 10 more. For Group A in this study, the use of the Pinyin system in Chinese teaching and their goals for learning Chinese also likely contribute to their agreement. Pinyin enables westerners to learn and speak Chinese without learning Chinese characters. Their previous experience learning western languages probably helps them master the Pinyin system.

The rate of agreement with Item 33 ("Everyone can learn to speak a foreign language") in this study is a little lower (63.9%) than in Horwitz's (1988) study on American students (72% to 83%). Among the three groups, Group C has the highest rate, with 76.7% agreement versus 70.0% for Group B and 56.6% for Group A.

The two statements with a high level of disagreement are Items 11 and 19 ("People who are good at mathematics or science are not good at learning foreign languages" and "Women are better than men at learning foreign languages"). The overall rate of disagreement for Item 11 is 70.7%, which is almost the same as in Horwitz's study (German, 71%; French, 69% and Spanish, 69%). However, there are some differences among the three groups in this study, especially with respect to Group A (64.5%) and Group C (83.7%). The much higher rate of disagreement in Group C is likely because Chinese families and

Chinese communities highly value mathematics and science, and regard them as symbols of intelligence. For Item 19, the overall rates of both agreement and neutrality for the students in this study are quite high (51.9% and 41.4%), and similar to Horwitz's study (36% to 60%). Interestingly, among the three groups in this study, Group B has the highest rate of disagreement, with 70% versus 59.4% for Group C and 43.4% for Group A, and the lowest rate of neutrality, with 25% versus 46.1% for Group A and 40.5% for Group C. The difference here seems to be related to gender, since Group B has many more female students (90.0%) than Group A (42.1%) and Group C (48.6%).

The overall rate of neutrality for Item 16 ("I have a special ability for learning foreign languages") is 42.9%, which is close to the responses in Horwitz's (1988) study (39% to 44%) and EFL learners in Park's (1995) study (46%) and Yang's (1992) study (43%). More than one third of subjects disagreed with Item 16 in this study, which is a little lower than the percentage of American students learning Japanese (beginner: 41% and intermediate: 55%) in Oh's (1996) study and EFL students in Truitt's (1995) and Kunt's (1997) studies (43.5% to 53%). For Item 16, Group C has the highest rate of neutrality (54.15% versus 40.8% for Group A and 30.0% for Group B), while Group B has the highest rate of both agreement and disagreement (25.0% and 40.0% respectively).

Fifty-three percent of the subjects chose neutrality with respect to Item 6 ("People from my country are good at learning foreign languages"). Group B has the highest rate of neutrality, with 75.0% versus 59.5% for Group C and 44.7% for Group A. Item 30 ("People who speak more than one language are very intelligent") also has a high rate of neutrality (64.7%), with 60.5% for Group A, 90.0% for Group B and 59.5% for Group C.

The Nature of Language Learning

The Nature of Language Learning category includes items 8, 12, 17, 23, 27 and 28. Among them, two items (8 and 12) concern the role of social cultural contact in language achievement, one item (27) is related to the subjects' perspectives on language learning as contrasted with other academic subjects and the other three items (23, 27 and 28) examine the subjects' focus in the language learning task.

Table 5.16 The Nature of Language Learning

Item	Group	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
B8	Non-Asian	17.1%	52.6%	22.4%	7.9%		2.21	.82
	Non-Chinese Asian		55.0%	40.0%	5.0%		2.50	.61
	Chinese-background		35.1%	32.4%	24.3%	8.1%	3.05	.97
Total		9.8%	48.1%	27.8%	12.0%	2.3%	2.49	.91
B12	Non-Asian	59.2%	30.3%	6.6%	1.3%	2.6%	1.58	.88
	Non-Chinese Asian	40.0%	35.0%	20.0%	5.0%		1.90	.91
	Chinese-background	43.2%	29.7%	21.6%	2.7%	2.7%	1.92	1.01
Total		51.9%	30.8%	12.8%	2.3%	2.3%	1.72	.93
B17	Non-Asian		39.5%	44.7%	11.8%	3.9%	2.80	.80
	Non-Chinese Asian		25.0%	60.0%	15.0%		2.90	.64
	Chinese-background	8.1%	32.4%	32.4%	21.6%	5.4%	2.84	1.04
Total		2.3%	35.3%	43.6%	15.0%	3.8%	2.83	.85
B23	Non-Asian	11.8%	26.3%	36.8%	23.7%	1.3%	2.76	.99
	Non-Chinese Asian		35.0%	40.0%	25.0%		2.90	.79
	Chinese-background	2.7%	24.3%	32.4%	35.1%	5.4%	3.16	.96
Total		7.5%	27.1%	36.1%	27.1%	2.3%	2.89	.96
B27	Non-Asian	38.2%	47.4%	9.2%	2.6%	2.6%	1.84	.90
	Non-Chinese Asian	35.0%	40.0%	5.0%	20.0%		2.10	1.12
	Chinese-background	27.0%	64.9%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	1.89	.81
Total		34.6%	51.1%	6.8%	5.3%	2.3%	1.89	.91
B28	Non-Asian	3.9%	15.8%	18.4%	48.7%	13.2%	3.51	1.04
	Non-Chinese Asian		20.0%	35.0%	45.0%		3.25	.79
	Chinese-background		2.7%	32.4%	54.1%	10.8%	3.73	.69
Total		2.3%	12.8%	24.8%	49.6%	10.5%	3.53	.93

Fifty-eight percent of the subjects agreed with Item 8 ("It is necessary to know about Chinese cultures in order to learn to speak Chinese well"), which is a higher percentage than that of American students learning German, French and Spanish (37% to 45%). It is especially worth noting that Group A, which has similar ethnic background to students in Horwitz's study, has a much higher rate of agreement (69.7%). The rate of strong agreement in Group A is also much higher (17.1%) than that of students (4% to 8%) in Horwitz's study.

Among the three groups in this study, Group A has the highest rate of agreement with Item 8 (69.7% versus 55.0% for Group B and 35.1% for Group C). Very interestingly, Group A is the only group that has students who strongly agree (17.1%) and Group C is the only one with students who strongly disagree (8.1%). Group C also has a much higher rate of disagreement, with 32.4% versus 7.9% for Group A and 5.0% for Group B.

The above data display a clear picture that ethnic background seems to play an important role in foreign language learning in this context. They show that the beliefs and attitudes about the importance of knowing culture in target language learning are related to ethnic background and the target language.

The agreement rate for Item 12 ("It is best to learn Chinese in an Chinese speaking country") is 82.7%, which is higher than that of American students learning German, French and Spanish (66% to 77%). Group A not only has a higher rate of agreement (89.5%) than Group B (75%) and Group C (72.9%), it also has a much higher rate of strong agreement (59.2% versus 40.0% and 43.2%). The difference between Group A and the other groups in this study and Horwitz's study also implies that ethnic backgrounds might influence beliefs about learning target languages in target language countries. For all three groups, the Chinese learning environment in China is perceived to be better than in the U.S. However, the benefits from the learning environment in China might be different for the three groups, especially when compared to their different learning environments in the U.S. This is probably a reason for

the much higher rate of agreement and strong agreement with Item 12 in Group A than in the other groups, since their learning environment improved the most.

Eighty-six percent of the subjects agreed with Item 27 ("Learning a foreign language is different than learning other academic subjects"), which is similar to American students learning German, French Spanish and Japanese (76% to 87%) (Horwitz, 1988; Kern, 1995 and Oh, 1996) and higher than EFL students (66% to 75%) (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kunt, 1997). Among the three groups, Group C has the highest rate of agreement, with 91.9% versus 85.6% for Group A and 75% for Group B.

Among the three items about the Nature of Language Learning, most subjects were neutral or agreed with Item 17 "The most important part of learning a foreign language is learning vocabulary" (43.6% neutrality and 35.3% agreement) and Item 23 "The most important part of learning a foreign language is learning the grammar" (36.1% neutrality and 34.6% agreement), and disagreed with Item 28 "The most important part of learning Chinese is learning how to translate from my native language"(60.1%).

The high rates of neutrality and agreement for Items 17 and 23 in this study contrasted with those of Horwitz's (1988) and Kern's (1995) studies, which reported a high rate of disagreement on Items 17 (45% to 92%) and 23 (40% to 83%, except 29% of Spanish in Horwitz's study). However, the responses in this study for these 2 items are relatively close to those in Oh's (1996) study of American students learning Japanese. Chinese and Japanese are less commonly taught foreign languages and the vocabulary and grammar are quite different from Western foreign languages. This situation might focus students on the importance of learning vocabulary and grammar. The other likely reasons for the difference are the differences in culture, learning environments and teaching methods in the US and China. The popularity of second language acquisition theory and practice and communication teaching methods in commonly taught

foreign languages in the U.S. make students learning those languages feel that learning vocabulary and grammar is not so important. However, traditional Chinese education theories and teaching methods (including Confucianism), which emphasize reading and writing, textbooks and teachers, and the memorization of vocabulary and grammar are still very popular in Chinese language teaching in the U.S. Most Chinese language teachers in China are not familiar with second language acquisition theories and communicative teaching methods and use only traditional Chinese teaching methods to teach Chinese (Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Anderson, 1993; Penner, 1995; Linnell, 2001). In such a learning environment, it is understandable why American students studying Chinese attach more importance to learning vocabulary and grammar than American students studying other foreign languages. This is the case even though most of them had also studied commonly taught foreign languages in the U.S. and therefore they have experienced the usefulness of communicative teaching methods just like other American students.

Learning and Communication Strategies

There are eight items in the area of Learning and Communication Strategies, including Items 7, 9, 13, 14, 18, 21, 22, and 26. Items 18 and 26 are related to learning strategies and the other eight items refer to communication strategies.

Ninety-three percent of subjects agreed with Item 7 ("It is important to repeat and practice a lot") (95% to 98% in Horwitz's study). For Item 18 ("It is important to practice with cassettes or tapes"), the subjects in this study have a lower rate of agreement (31.6%) and a relatively higher rate of neutrality (42.1%) than the American students (agreement: 58%, 84% and 71%; neutrality: 40%, 9% and 17%). Learning a foreign language in the target language country provides

Table 5.17 Learning and Communication Strategies

Item	Group	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
B7	Non-Asian	48.7%	36.8%	3.9%	10.5%		1.76	.95
	Non-Chinese Asian	30.0%	55.0%	5.0%	10.0%		1.95	.89
	Chinese-background	43.2%	48.6%		5.4%	2.7%	1.76	.93
Total		44.4%	42.9%	3.0%	9.0%	.8%	1.79	.93
B9	Non-Asian	3.9%	5.3%	5.3%	31.6%	53.9%	4.26	1.05
	Non-Chinese Asian	5.0%	10.0%		70.0%	15.0%	3.80	1.01
	Chinese-background	5.4%	5.4%	13.5%	45.9%	29.7%	3.89	1.07
Total		4.5%	6.0%	6.8%	41.4%	41.4%	4.09	1.06
B13	Non-Asian	42.1%	46.1%	3.9%	7.9%		1.78	.86
	Non-Chinese Asian	25.0%	55.0%	10.0%	10.0%		2.05	.89
	Chinese-background	54.1%	24.3%	13.5%	8.1%		1.76	.98
Total		42.9%	41.4%	7.5%	8.3%		1.81	.90
B14	Non-Asian	34.2%	38.2%	9.2%	5.3%		2.25	1.34
	Non-Chinese Asian	15.0%	45.0%	30.0%	10.0%		2.35	.88
	Chinese-background	8.1%	54.1%	27.0%	5.4%	5.4%	2.46	.93
Total		24.1%	43.6%	17.3%	6.0%	9.0%	2.32	1.17
B18	Non-Asian	40.8%	50.0%	3.9%	1.3%	3.9%	1.78	.90
	Non-Chinese Asian	50.0%	40.0%		10.0%		1.70	.92
	Chinese-background	54.1%	43.2%	2.7%			1.49	.56
Total		45.9%	46.6%	3.0%	2.3%	2.3%	1.68	.83
B21	Non-Asian	11.8%	30.3%	11.8%	35.5%	10.5%	3.03	1.25
	Non-Chinese Asian		20.0%	35.0%	40.0%	5.0%	3.30	.86
	Chinese-background	5.4%	40.5%	27.0%	18.9%	8.1%	2.84	1.07
Total		8.3%	31.6%	19.5%	31.6%	9.0%	3.02	1.15
B22	Non-Asian	10.5%	27.6%	10.5%	40.8%	10.5%	3.13	1.24
	Non-Chinese Asian	10.0%	15.0%	25.0%	30.0%	20.0%	3.35	1.27
	Chinese-background	10.8%	32.4%	21.6%	27.0%	8.1%	2.89	1.17
Total		10.5%	27.1%	15.8%	35.3%	11.3%	3.10	1.22
B26	Non-Asian	2.6%	27.6%	39.5%	26.3%	3.9%	3.01	.90
	Non-Chinese Asian	10.0%	35.0%	40.0%	15.0%		2.60	0.88
	Chinese-background	2.7%	24.3%	48.6%	18.9%	5.4%	3.00	.88
Total		3.8%	27.8%	42.1%	22.6%	3.8%	2.95	.90

good opportunities to practice the language with real people and therefore rote practice would seem to be less important.

Eighty-seven percent of the subjects agreed with Item 7 ("It is important to speak Chinese with excellent pronunciation"), a much higher percentage than that of the American students studying commonly taught languages. However, it is close to that of American students studying Japanese (71% to 90%) (Oh, 1996) and that of EFL students in East Asia (78% to 97%) (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995). East Asian languages, especially Chinese, use mainly ideograph systems, rather than the alphabetic systems of Western languages. Both American students studying East Asian languages and East Asian students studying English must learn completely different pronunciation systems. In contrast, when English speakers study a Western language, the similar alphabetic systems help them learn how to pronounce and understand it. Speaking Chinese with excellent pronunciation is particularly important, since Chinese is an ideographical and tonal language. In Chinese, the meaning of a word can be different if the same pronunciation is paired with different tones. Among the three groups, Group C has a higher rate of agreement with Item 7 (91.8%) than Group A (85.5%) and Group B (85.0%). One important reason for the higher rate in Group C might be that many students grew up in a Chinese dialect speaking family, such as Cantonese and thus understand the importance of correct pronunciation. Most Chinese dialects have completely different pronunciation systems, and people cannot communicate with each other when speaking different dialects. It might be even more difficult for dialect speakers to learn to pronounce Mandarin correctly than those who never learned Chinese previously.

The rate of disagreement with Item 9 ("You shouldn't say any thing in Chinese until you can say it correctly") is 82.8%, a rate close to that of the American students reported in previous studies (73% to 88%) (Horwitz, 1988 and Kern, 1995). This rate is also a little higher than that of American students studying Japanese (69% to 75%) (Oh, 1996). Although the rate of disagreement among the three groups is not very different, the rate of strong disagreement is. Group A has the highest rate of strong disagreement, with 53.9% versus 15.0%

for Group B and 29.7% for Group C. The difference here might stem from the different ethnic cultures. In East Asian cultures, " face" is very important and "losing face" is very serious (Sue & Morishima, 1982; Lin et al., 2001). If you cannot say something correctly, you have "lost face." Many students from East Asia seldom speak in their classes if they think they cannot speak correctly, even though they know how important it is to speak when studying a foreign language.

Eighty-four percent of the subjects agreed with Item 13 ("I enjoy practicing Chinese with the Chinese people that I meet"), a much higher percentage than found for American students learning other languages (29% to 46%). Wanting to speak Chinese with native speakers is probably one of the main reasons why these students came to China to study Chinese in the first place. The rate of agreement for Group A, B and C is 88.2%, 80.0% and 78.4% respectively.

With respect to Item 21 ("I feel timid speaking Chinese with other people"), the responses are a little unusual, because the rates of agreement (31.6%) and strong agreement (8.3%) are almost the same as the rates for disagreement (31.6%) and strong disagreement (9.0%). The subjects, thus, have divided views on this statement. Among the three groups, Group A has the highest rate of disagreement (46.0%) and Group C has the highest rate of agreement (45.9%). Again differences between Group A and Group C might stern from their different cultural influence.

Sixty-eight percent of the subjects overall agreed with Item 14 ("It's O.K. to guess if you don't know a word in Chinese"). Group A has a much higher rate of both agreement and strong agreement (82.4% and 34.2%) than Group B (60.0% and 15%) or Group C (62.2% and 8.1%). Both rates of agreement and strong agreement for Group A are especially high when compared to those of American students learning German, French and Spanish (38% to 62% agreement and 5% to 10% strong agreement). There are probably two main reasons why Group A agrees with this statement. Most Chinese characters consist of radicals and components, which relate to sound or meaning. Guessing

is very useful in memorizing, recognizing and recalling the characters. In addition, the study abroad environment gives learners the opportunity to make contact directly with local people and interact with real language situations. This contact with real life language use probably encourages them to guess more often than students studying in their home country.

For Item 22 ("If beginning students are permitted to make errors in Chinese, it will be difficult for them to speak correctly later on"), the rates of agreement, neutrality and disagreement were 27.2%, 15.8% and 46.6% respectively in this study. The high rate of disagreement here is contrary to the high rate of agreement for American students (48% to 57%) (Horwitz, 1988). However, compared with Group A and Group B, Group C has a higher rate of agreement (43.2% versus 38.1% and 35.0%) and a lower rate of disagreement (35.1% versus 51.3% and 50%). The reason that Group A and Group B have a much higher disagreement with Item 22 might be due to the Chinese pronunciation system. Pronouncing Chinese correctly requires the mastery of the complicated tone system and some easily confused consonants. If students are not permitted to make oral errors in the beginning, they will have to stop speaking very often because of teachers' correction, which might cause frustration. Therefore, it might be natural for Groups A and B to disagree. For many students of Group C, the interference from their dialectal Chinese makes it difficult to speak correctly. Their Chinese learning experience probably makes them more aware about how difficult it is to correct pronunciation errors later on.

Motivation and Expectations

Items 20 and 29 concern the perceived importance of specific target language and job expectations. It is very interesting to see that there are contrasting beliefs about these two items between American students learning

Chinese in China and American students learning commonly taught foreign languages in the U.S. When compared with American students learning Japanese (Oh, 1996) and EFL students (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995 and Kunt, 1997), the subjects in this study agree with respect to Item 29, but disagree on Item 20.

Table 5.18 Motivation and Expectations

Item	Group	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
B20	Non-Asian	6.6%	9.2%	19.7%	39.5%	25.0%	3.67	1.15
	Non-Chinese Asian	10.0%	10.0%	25.0%	45.0%	10.0%	3.35	1.14
	Chinese-background	13.5%	13.5%	29.7%	40.5%	2.7%	3.05	1.10
Total		9.0%	10.5%	23.3%	40.6%	16.5%	3.45	1.16
B29	Non-Asian	46.1%	34.2%	13.2%	2.6%	3.9%	1.84	1.02
	Non-Chinese Asian	20.0%	40.0%	25.0%	15.0%		2.35	.99
	Chinese-background	27.0%	48.6%	21.6%		2.7%	2.03	.87
Total		36.8%	39.1%	17.3%	3.8%	3.0%	1.97	.98
B31	Non-Asian	78.9%	13.2%	3.9%		3.9%	1.37	.89
	Non-Chinese Asian	75.0%	15.0%		10.0%		1.45	.94
	Chinese-background	91.9%	8.1%				1.08	.28
Total		82.0%	12.0%	2.3%	1.5%	2.3%	1.30	.79
B32	Non-Asian	48.7%	34.2%	13.2%	3.9%		1.72	.84
	Non-Chinese Asian	45.0%	45.0%		10.0%		1.75	.91
	Chinese-background	40.5%	29.7%	27.0%		2.7%	1.95	.97
Total		45.9%	34.6%	15.0%	3.8%	.8%	1.79	.89

For Item 20 "People in my country feel that it is important to speak Chinese" or other target languages, the subjects in this study have a much lower rate of agreement (19.5% of agreement and 57.1% of disagreement) than American students learning German, French, Spanish (agreement: 46% to 64%) (Horwitz, 1988) and Japanese (agreement: 52% to 55%) (Oh, 1996) and EFL learners (agreement: 74% to 90%) (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995, Truitt, 1995 and Kunt, 1997). Among the three groups, Group A has a higher rate of

disagreement (64.5%) than Group B (55.0%) and Group C (42.7%). Their beliefs show a clear picture that American people, especially those with Non-Asian backgrounds, do not think that Chinese is an important foreign language. This finding is puzzling since there is a big population of Chinese students from China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, as well as many prosperous Chinese communities and many imported Chinese products in the U.S. Group B and Group C, especially the latter, disagree less strongly, possibly because of their ethnic origins. Japanese, though it is also a less commonly taught Asian language, is still seen as a more important foreign language than Chinese by American people, which shows that advanced economic power might play an important role in American's views on the importance of a particular foreign language.

Interestingly, the subjects are optimistic about their job prospects, even though they have a pessimistic view of other people's opinions about the importance of speaking Chinese. Seventy-six of the subjects agreed with Item 29 "If I learn Chinese very well, I will have better opportunities for a good job". For the same Item, American students had a high level of disagreement ranging from 39% to 84% (Horwitz, 1988 and Kern, 1995). However, the agreement in this study is a little lower than that for EFL students (87% to 90% in four studies and 74% in Truitt's study) (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kunt, 1997 and Kim-Yoon, 2000), but a little higher than that of American students learning Japanese (44% to 62 %) (Oh, 1996). The positive view with respect to job opportunities for successful Chinese learners shows that the subjects in this study have independent thoughts on the usefulness of Chinese in their future career pursuits, as well as strong instrumental motivation, especially in group A. Group A had 80.3% agreement with Item 29 and 64.5% disagreement with Item 20, and both these percentages are higher than those found in Group B and Group C. Japanese learners in the U.S. and EFL learners also have a high rate of agreement with Item 29, however, in contrast to Chinese, the languages that they are

learning are thought of as important foreign languages by people in their countries

The subjects' strong motivation is shown by their unusually strong agreement (82%) with Item 31 "I want to learn to speak Chinese well." If the 12.0% agreement is added, this number reaches 94.0%. This percentage is much higher than those of American students learning German, French and Spanish (11% to 25% of strong agreement and 28% to 41% of agreement) (Horwitz, 1988). American students learning Japanese show a close rate of the total agreement (92.5% to 97.1%), but a much lower rate of strong agreement (48.1% to 69.8%) when compared with the subjects in this study. The data here indicates that American students learning Chinese have a much stronger motivation to speak their target language well than American students learning other foreign languages. Group C has the strongest will to speak Chinese well, with 100% agreement (strong agreement: 91.9%) versus 92.1% (strong agreement: 78.9%) for Group A and 80% (strong agreement: 75.0.0%) for Group B. The unusual 100% agreement in Group C might also show a strong ethnic culture influence. There is an almost unanimous view among Chinese families, Chinese communities and Chinese people that you must be able to speak Chinese if your ethnic background is Chinese. If you cannot speak Chinese you will feel inferior and looked down upon by comparison, since almost every Chinese you meet anywhere can speak Chinese. This situation makes these ethnic learners not only have strong instrumental motivation but also strong integrative motivation.

Item 32 "I would like to have Chinese friends" is especially related to integrative motivation. Eighty-one percent of the subjects agreed with the statement, a much higher rate than for American students learning German (42%), French (48% to 53%) Spanish (46%) and Japanese (69%) (Horwitz, 1988; Kern, 1995 and Oh, 1996). This rate is also contrary to those of EFL students, who show a higher rate of disagreement (38% to 80%) (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995, Truitt, 1995 and Kunt, 1997). The data demonstrate that the American students

learning Chinese in this study have a much stronger integrative motivation than American students studying other foreign languages or EFL students. Since study abroad programs provide much better opportunities for students to have target language friends and learn about the culture, the strong integrative motivation might be one of the main reasons the students decided to go abroad to study. It is also interesting to note that Group A and Group B have a much stronger desire to have Chinese friends than Group C (82.9% and 90.0% versus 70.2%). The reason might again be ethnic backgrounds. Because the subjects in Group C come from Chinese background families and grew up in Chinese environments, it is not so important for them to make new Chinese friends, since they already have Chinese families, relatives and family friends.

Descriptive Analysis of the BALLI Plus

In this study, 12 additional BALLI items were designed to explore the subjects' specific beliefs about learning Chinese and learning Chinese in China. Items 35 to 40 were designed to examine the subjects' perspectives on several controversial areas of learning Chinese and Items 41 to 46 probed students' specific views and evaluations of studying Chinese in China, especially compared with their previous language studies in the U.S.

Perspectives on Learning Chinese

Because of the unique characteristics of the Chinese language system as well as for historic reasons, some areas of Chinese learning and teaching are very controversial, especially with respect to pronunciation and Chinese characters. For example, should or should not students use the Pinyin pronunciation system be used and if so, for how long; when and how many Chinese characters should be introduced; whether to learn simplified or traditional Chinese characters or

both; and whether it is necessary to emphasize recognizing and writing Chinese characters.

Eighty percent of the subjects in this study endorsed Item 35 "I want to learn to write Chinese well" and the percentages for Group A, Group B and

Table 5.19 Perspectives on Learning Chinese

Item	Group	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
B35	Non-Asian	56.6%	25.0%	7.9%	6.6%	3.9%	1.76	1.11
	Non-Chinese Asian	55.0%	15.0%	15.0%	15.0%		1.90	1.17
	Chinese-background	54.1%	32.4%	8.1%	5.4%		1.65	.86
Total		55.6%	25.6%	9.0%	7.5%	2.3%	1.75	1.05
B36	Non-Asian	17.1%	27.6%	27.6%	23.7%	3.9%	2.70	1.13
	Non-Chinese Asian		60.0%	35.0%	5.0%		2.45	.60
	Chinese-background	13.5%	18.9%	51.4%	8.1%	8.1%	2.78	1.06
Total		13.5%	30.1%	35.3%	16.5%	4.5%	2.68	1.05
B37	Non-Asian	47.4%	27.6%	14.5%	6.6%	3.9%	1.92	1.12
	Non-Chinese Asian	45.0%	40.0%	10.0%	5.0%		1.75	.85
	Chinese-background	29.7%	51.4%	16.2%	2.7%		1.92	.76
Total		42.1%	36.1%	14.3%	5.3%	2.3%	1.89	.99
B38	Non-Asian	13.2%	28.9%	23.7%	25.0%	9.2%	2.88	1.20
	Non-Chinese Asian	15.0%	40.0%	15.0%	30.0%		2.60	1.10
	Chinese-background	8.1%	45.9%	10.8%	27.0%	8.1%	2.81	1.17
Total		12.0%	35.3%	18.8%	26.3%	7.5%	2.82	1.17
B39	Non-Asian	27.6%	25.0%	22.4%	22.4%	2.6%	2.47	1.19
	Non-Chinese Asian	15.0%	10.0%	55.0%	15.0%	5.0%	2.85	1.04
	Chinese-background	29.7%	35.1%	8.1%	27.0%		2.32	1.18
Total		26.3%	25.6%	23.3%	22.6%	2.3%	2.49	1.17
B40	Non-Asian	2.6%	11.8%	19.7%	53.9%	11.8%	3.61	.94
	Non-Chinese Asian	5.0%	20.0%		75.0%		3.45	1.00
	Chinese-background		27.0%	18.9%	45.9%	8.1%	3.35	.98
Total		2.3%	17.3%	16.5%	54.9%	9.0%	3.51	.96

Group C were 81.6%, 70.0% and 86.5% respectively. Most students (55.6%) strongly agreed with the statement, with 56% for Group A versus 55.0% for Group B and 54.1% for Group C. The strong will to write Chinese well among

the three groups contrasts with the popular view among American Chinese language teachers that most students, especially Non-Asian students, only want to learn to listen to and to speak Chinese. However, the contrasting beliefs between the subjects and American Chinese language teachers here do not prove that the American teachers are wrong. It actually shows that the beliefs about writing Chinese of the American students studying Chinese in China are different from those students learning Chinese in the U.S., especially Non-Asian background students. Their strong wills to write Chinese well likely result not only from their strong motivations, especially integrative motivation, but also because they enjoy foreign language learning and believe that they are good language learners. (Please refer to the discussion of motivation in this section and the Descriptive Statistics and Analysis of the Background Variables sections).

Items 36 and 37 concern how to deal with Roman letters (Pinyin) and Chinese characters at the beginning of Chinese learning. Forty-four percent of the subjects agreed with Item 36 "Students should start with Roman letters (Pinyin) when they begin to learn Chinese." Interestingly, Group B has a much higher rate of agreement (60%) than Group A (44.7%) and Group C (31.4%). The reason that Group B emphasizes Roman letters (Pinyin) likely results from their ethnic language background. Compared with Group A, Group B's ethnic language background makes it easier to understand Chinese culture and the Chinese writing system, especially Chinese characters. However, the pronunciation system of Chinese is completely different from that of their ethnic languages especially because their ethnic languages do not have tones. Therefore, they prefer learning Pinyin and characters at the same time during the beginning stage of language learning (The following description of Items 38 and 39 that dealt with opinions about the difficult aspects of learning Chinese further supports this view). The beliefs about Item 36 in Group A are actually mixed (27.6% of neutrality and 27.6% of disagreement), though they have a higher rate

of agreement than the other groups. This mixed picture is probably related to their own complicated goals and motivations towards learning Chinese.

Contrary to Item 36, the subjects overwhelmingly endorsed Item 37 "Chinese characters should be introduced as early as possible" (78.2%). Among the three groups, once again, Group B has the highest rate of agreement, with 85.0% versus 75.0% for Group A and 81.1% for Group C. Group B has a higher agreement rate on both Items 36 and 37 which shows that they prefer starting with Roman letters and introducing Chinese characters early. As explained above, because of their ethnic language background, Chinese writing system, especially Chinese characters, is not difficult for them to learn, so they prefer to learn Roman letters and Chinese characters at the same time. Very interestingly, agreement with Item 37 in Group A is even higher than that in Group C. It is also opposite to a prevailing phenomenon among students learning Chinese with the same Non-Asian background in the U.S. Most of these students in the U.S., including students with Chinese backgrounds who start to learn Chinese when growing up, usually want to put off learning Chinese characters and some of them even want to avoid Chinese characters entirely (Wang, 1989; Norman, 1996; Pease, 1996). The contrasting attitudes to Chinese characters between Group A and the students learning Chinese with the same background in the U.S shows that the subjects in Group A probably are more serious Chinese learners with stronger motivation, especially integrative motivation, and clear goals for learning Chinese. Their strong beliefs about introducing Chinese characters early might also result from their different learning environment. When Chinese is taught in the U.S., the characters are usually postponed for a period of time. Chinese characters in textbooks and teaching materials are usually paired with Pinyin for a long time. Some textbooks and Chinese classes designed for Non-Asian background students never show Chinese characters. When coming to China to learn Chinese, students suddenly find that Chinese characters without Pinyin are everywhere. Without knowing Chinese characters, they are just as

blind people even if they master spoken Chinese. This reality makes them become strongly aware of the necessity and usefulness of Chinese characters. Emphasizing learning characters, reading and writing from the beginning in their classes in China and Chinese traditional teaching methods further enforce this awareness.

It is controversial among the subjects as to which part of Chinese learning is the most difficult. Seventy-seven percent chose pronunciation, and fifty-two percent chose Chinese characters. Group B shows an obvious difference from the other two groups again. Group B has the highest rate of endorsing pronunciation, with 55% versus 42.1% of Group A and 53.0% of Group C and also the lowest rate of endorsing Chinese characters, with 25% versus 52.6% of Group A and 64.8% of Group C. The relatively higher rate of endorsing pronunciation and the incredibly low rate of endorsing Chinese characters show clearly that Chinese characters are not difficult for them, especially compared with the other two groups and pronunciation. Again their ethnic language background seems to have played a role in this result. Please see the discussion of Items 35, 36 and 37 about Group B.

Interestingly, for Item 38, Group A has the closest rate of agreement and disagreement (42.1% versus 34.2%) and the highest rate of neutrality (23.7%) among the three groups. Thus, Group A has a different and more mixed opinion about the difficulty of pronunciation, compared with the other two groups. Group C's choices about Items 38 and 39 seem confusing, because there is a more than fifty percent endorsement of both items (53% and 64.8% respectively). It is obvious that some students in Group C had difficulty deciding which was most difficult part of learning Chinese and chose both.

There is a high overall rate of disagreement (63.9) with Item 40 ("I believe that if I can recognize the meaning of the Chinese characters, it is not important to be able to write the Chinese characters"). Group B displays a much higher rate of disagreement (75%) than Group A (65.7%) or Group C (54.0%).

Writing Chinese characters is much more difficult and time consuming than recognizing Chinese characters. In fact, Chinese children usually spend several years in elementary schools learning how to write Chinese characters correctly and clearly. That is why recognizing Chinese characters, not writing Chinese characters, becomes the main goal in many Chinese classes in the U.S. The very high rate of disagreement with this item and the very high rate of agreement with Item 35 (" I want to learn to write Chinese well") shows that the American students studying Chinese in China highly value the importance of writing Chinese characters and have a strong desire to master Chinese writing. Their opinion and desire likely reflects their strong motivation to learn Chinese.

Views and Evaluations about Learning Chinese in China

Items 41 and 44 were used to probe the students' general views about studying Chinese abroad. Items 42, 43, 45 and 46 explore the subjects' specific views and evaluations about learning Chinese in China, compared with their Chinese learning experiences in the U.S., with respect to Chinese teaching methods, Chinese classes, Chinese programs and Chinese teachers.

Seventy-two percent of the subjects in this study endorsed Item 41 ("I believe that if I want to learn Chinese well I must study Chinese aboard"). It shows that the subjects strongly support the importance of going to China to study Chinese. They highly value the opportunity of learning Chinese in China. However, there is a big difference of agreement, especially strong agreement among the three groups. Group A has a much higher rate of endorsement than Group B and Group C (85.6% versus 60.0% and 51.3%). It is especially worth noting that Group A's strong agreement rate (47%) is over double that of Group C (21.6%) and over triple that of Group B (10.0%). Learning Chinese in China is likely much more important for Group A, because they get a much better socio-cultural context and learning environment in China than in the U.S. For Group B

and Group C, especially Group C, the socio-cultural context and learning environment in China are not so much different from the situation they have in the U.S., since they have a much better socio-cultural context and learning environment in the home and community than Group A.

Table 5.20 Views and Evaluation of Learning Chinese in China

Item	Group	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
B41	Non-Asian	47.4%	38.2%	10.5%	1.3%	2.6%	1.74	.90
	Non-Chinese Asian	10.0%	50.0%	20.0%	10.0%	10.0%	2.60	1.14
	Chinese-background	21.6%	29.7%	27.0%	21.6%		2.49	1.07
Total		34.6%	37.6%	16.5%	8.3%	3.0%	2.08	1.06
B42	Non-Asian	15.8%	22.4%	35.5%	22.4%	3.9%	2.76	1.09
	Non-Chinese Asian	15.0%	25.0%	35.0%	15.0%	10.0%	2.80	1.20
	Chinese-background	2.7%	8.1%	70.3%	18.9%		3.05	.62
Total		12.0%	18.8%	45.1%	20.3%	3.8%	2.85	1.00
B43	Non-Asian	14.5%	25.0%	35.5%	19.7%	5.3%	2.76	1.09
	Non-Chinese Asian	10.0%	35.0%	50.0%	5.0%		2.50	.76
	Chinese-background	5.4%	27.0%	51.4%	16.2%		2.78	.79
Total		11.3%	27.1%	42.1%	16.5%	3.0%	2.73	.97
B44	Non-Asian	39.5%	26.3%	23.7%	7.9%	2.6%	2.08	1.09
	Non-Chinese Asian	30.0%	35.0%	30.0%	5.0%		2.10	.91
	Chinese-background	13.5%	37.8%	43.2%	5.4%		2.41	.80
Total		30.8%	30.8%	30.1%	6.8%	1.5%	2.17	1.00
B45	Non-Asian	19.7%	51.3%	21.1%	7.9%	100.0%	2.17	.84
	Non-Chinese Asian	35.0%	30.0%	35.0%		100.0%	2.00	.86
	Chinese-background	8.1%	64.9%	21.6%	5.4%	100.0%	2.24	.68
Total		18.8%	51.9%	23.3%	6.0%	100.0%	2.17	.80
B46	Non-Asian	5.3%	10.5%	60.5%	22.4%	1.3%	3.04	.77
	Non-Chinese Asian	20.0%	15.0%	55.0%	5.0%	5.0%	2.60	1.05
	Chinese-background		5.4%	89.2%	5.4%		3.00	.33
Total		6.0%	9.8%	67.7%	15.0%	1.5%	2.96	.74

The big difference in strong agreement among the three groups for Item 41 is also likely connected to their motivation, especially their integrative

motivation. There is a positive relationship between interest in Chinese culture and endorsement of Item 41. For the question "Why do you want to learn Chinese," 30.3% of Group A chose "Interest in culture" as their number 1 reason to learn Chinese on the list of 8 factors, compared with no one in Group B or Group C. The rates for choosing "Interest in culture" as the number 2 reason in Group A, Group B and Group C were 32.9%, 0% and 18.9% respectively. The joint rate of choosing "Interest in culture" as one reason to learn Chinese in Group A (82.9%) and Group C (83.7%) is much higher than that in group B (35%). Although the total choosing "Interest in culture" is close between Group A and Group C, its rank shows a big difference. 63.2% chose it as the number 1 (30.3%) or number 2 (32.9%) factors in Group A versus 18.9% for the number 2 factor in Group C (Please see Tables 5.1 and 5.2 Motivation towards Learning Chinese (1) and (2)). The lowest interest in Chinese culture from Group B likely resulted in the lowest rate of endorsement of the importance and necessarily of studying Chinese abroad. A much higher rank of "Interest in culture" in Group A than in Group C makes Group A give a much higher strong endorsement with Item 41 than that of Group C. The total similar rate of "Interested in culture" between Group A and Group C also makes their agreement rate with item 41 similar.

For Item 44, which compared Chinese language class in China with learning Chinese in Chinese society, 61.6% of the subjects favored Chinese society and believed that learning Chinese in Chinese society was important and useful. If the choice of neutrality is added, the percentage becomes 91.7%. It is obvious that the subjects in this study value learning Chinese in Chinese society much more than learning Chinese in Chinese language class in China. Therefore, it is more likely that the target language society not the target language class attracted the subjects to study abroad among the three groups.

For Item 42 "The methods of Chinese language teaching are more effective in China than in the U.S.," the choices of the subjects are mixed. Fifty-

five percent of the subjects chose neutrality, 30.8% favored the methods in China and 24.1% favored the methods in the U.S. The choices among the three groups also display a quite mixed picture. Group C has the highest rate of neutrality (70.3%) and the lowest rate of both agreement (10.8%) and disagreement (18.9%). Group C is also the only group where the rate of disagreement is higher than the agreement. Unlike Group C, the choices of agreement, neutrality and disagreement are quite close in Group A (38.2%, 35.5% and 24.3%) and Group B (40.0%, 35.0% and 30%). The high rate of neutrality and the close rate of agreement and disagreement with Item 42 in the three groups might explain that the subjects have quite different opinions on the effectiveness of Chinese teaching methods, based on their personal backgrounds and previous foreign language experiences. The very high rates of neutrality and disagreement in Group C might result from their personal learning experiences in local Chinese classes in the U.S., where the Chinese programs and teaching methods are specially designed for Chinese background students.

There is also a high rate of neutrality (42.1%) with Item 43 "Instruction of Chinese language class in China is more interesting than in the U.S." However, the rate of agreement is much higher than disagreement (38.4% versus 19.0%). Group B has the highest rate of agreement (45%) and the lowest rate of disagreement (5.0%).

The evaluation of the study abroad programs by the subjects is positive. Sixty-two percent of the subjects endorsed the statement "Overall, my Chinese language study program in China is excellent." Although the rate of endorsement is relatively close among Group A, Group B and Group C (71.0%, 65% and 73.0%), the rate of strong agreement shows a big difference. Group B has the highest rate of strong agreement (35%) and Group C has the lowest (8.1%), with Group A in the middle (19.7%). The difference of strong agreement here is very interesting, because the opinions of the subjects actually reflect the real situation of the study abroad programs in China. Among students who study Chinese in

China, an overwhelming majority of students (more than 80%) come from Japan, Korea and Southeast Asian countries. The study abroad programs in China are primarily designed for them. There have been a few Chinese programs for Chinese background students in China; however, they were designed for Chinese background students from Southeast Asian countries. Although some study abroad programs for American students are designed for English speakers, the teachers, instruction methods and even instructional materials are almost the same as for the Chinese programs for Japanese and Korean students. Therefore, it is not hard to understand why Group B has a much approval rate of their programs, since the programs are more suitable to their backgrounds and situations. In contrast, the special needs of Chinese background students have not received much attention in the Chinese programs in China.

The situation is similar with respect to the evaluation of the Chinese language teachers in China. Group B once again express much more favor for Chinese language teachers in China than the other two groups. Group B has a much higher rate of both the total endorsement (35.0%) and strong endorsement (20.0%) than that of Group A (10.3% and 5.3%) or Group C (0.0% and 5.4%). However, generally speaking, the subjects evaluate the Chinese programs higher than they evaluate the Chinese language teachers in China (23.3% of neutrality and 70.7% positive versus 67.7% of neutrality and 15.8% of positive). Group C has the highest rate of neutrality for Item 46 (89.9% versus 60.5% of Group B and 55.0% of Group C) with exactly the same rate of both strong agreement and agreement and strong disagreement and disagreement (0.0% and 5.4%). Interestingly, Group A has the highest rate of disagreement (23.7%), which is even higher than agreement (15.8%). The main reason for Group A to favor Chinese language teachers in the U.S. might result from those teachers' better English proficiency, more awareness of American culture and more flexible and interesting instruction methods.

Descriptive Analysis of FLCAS

The FLCAS was designed to measure the anxiety levels of foreign language learners in the foreign language classroom. Scores on the FLCAS can range from 33 to 165, with higher scores expressing higher levels of anxiety. The FLCAS was used in this study to measure the foreign language anxiety levels of the American college students learning Chinese in China. The results obtained from the FLCAS are described and the mean scores for several subgroups are compared in this section.

The FLCAS Scores of the Three Ethnic Groups

Table 5.21 shows that the mean score on the FLCAS for the three ethnic groups was 110.21, and the range was 58 to 145. The standard deviation was 14.29. The total FLCAS mean score for Group A was 110.05, and the range was 58 to 142, with a standard deviation of 14.78; and for Group B was 111.05, ranging from 89 to134, with a standard deviation of 13.94; and for Group C was 110.02, ranging from 59 to 145, with a standard deviation of 13.81. Group B has a little slightly higher score than Group A and Group C, however, the mean scores are quite close. The results of an ANOVA (Table 5.22) and Post Hoc

Table 5.21 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by Ethnic Groups

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
Non-Asian	76	110.0526	14.77646	1.69498	58.00	142.00
Non-Chinese Asian	20	111.1500	13.93698	3.11640	89.00	134.00
Chinese-background	37	110.0270	13.81120	2.27055	89.00	145.00
Total	133	110.2105	14.28978	1.23908	58.00	145.00

Table 5.22 ANOVA of FLCAS Scores by Ethnic Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	20.793	2	10.396	.050	.951
Within Groups	26933.312	130	207.179		
Total	26954.105	132			

Table 5.23 Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons of FLCAS Scores by Ethnic Groups

Tukey HSD

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
1 Non-Asian	2 Non-Chinese Asian	-1.0974	3.61732	.951
	3 Chinese-background	.0256	2.88539	1.000
2 Non-Chinese Asian	1 Non-Asian	1.0974	3.61732	.951
	3 Chinese-background	1.1230	3.99480	.957
3 Chinese-background	1 Non-Asian	-.0256	2.88539	1.000
	2 Non-Chinese Asian	-1.1230	3.99480	.957

Multiple Comparisons (Table 5.23) show that there are no significant differences in the mean scores among the three ethnic groups.

It is worth noting that although the total mean anxiety scores among the three ethnic groups indicate that the anxiety levels the three groups experienced in China are almost the same, the sources of anxiety for them are likely different. American culture and their foreign language learning experiences in the U.S. likely make Group A less anxious than the other two groups, though the completely different ethnic language and culture in China could make them more anxious than the other two. The characteristics of East Asian culture, such as shyness, inwardness (Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000), "other orientation" and restrictive and controlling child-rearing practice (Chang, 1997) make it easier for Groups B and C to become anxious than Group A, though their same or similar ethnic languages and cultures should make them less anxious in learning Chinese in

China than Group A. This phenomenon shows that the influence of ethnic backgrounds and the special situation of learning Chinese in China make the three groups have almost the same level of anxiety, though the influences are different for the different groups.

When compared with previous studies using the FLCAS, the mean score in this study is the highest. Horwitz (1986) reported a mean score of 94.5 with a standard deviation of 21.4 in her study of American students learning Spanish, while Aida's study (1994) on American students learning Japanese showed a mean score of 96.7 with a standard deviation of 22.1. In Oh's study (1996) on American students learning Japanese, the mean scores of the first year and second year Japanese language students were 93.32 with a standard deviation of 18.77 and 94.8 with a standard deviation of 23.73 respectively. The two studies on EFL students in East Asian countries demonstrated relatively higher mean scores. Truitt's study (1997) in Korea reported a mean score of 101.2 with a standard deviation of 23.37 and Yan's study (1998) in China showed a mean score of 103.97 with a standard deviation of 17.26. The higher mean score in this study than in all other studies likely indicates that American students learning Chinese in China experience higher levels of anxiety than American students learning foreign languages in the U.S. or EFL students in their own countries. The higher mean scores in this study as well as in the two EFL studies in East Asian countries suggest that the ethnic languages and cultures of the students as well as the countries where they study might play an important role in anxiety.

The FLCAS Scores of Subgroups by Ages, Gender and Educational Background

As can be seen in Table 5.24, the mean anxiety score among the three age groups of 16-18, 19-24 and 25-39 consistently increases as the age of the groups

increases. However, the result of ANOVA shows that these differences are not significant.

Table 5.24 indicates that female students have a much higher FLCAS score than males. The result of a T-test reveals that there is a significant difference between the two groups: t=88.94, p< .001.

Table 5.24 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by Age and Gender

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
Age	16-18	19	106.5789	10.4526	2.3980	89.00	122.00
	19-24	99	110.4141	13.9642	1.4035	58.00	145.00
	25-39	15	113.4667	19.7552	5.1008	78.00	142.00
Gender	Female	80	113.1375	11.5712	1,2937	89.00	142.00
	Male	53	105.7925	16.7887	2,3061	58.00	145.00

Table 5.25 T-test of FLCAS Scores by Gender

	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Gender	32.818	132	.000	1.3985	.4914	4.261E-02
Mean score	88.945	132	.000	110.2105	14.2898	1.2391

Table 5.26 shows that the mean anxiety score among the different education levels consistently decreases as the education level increases, though again the results of the ANOVA shows no significant differences.

As Table 5.26 shows, there are some important differences among the mean scores for some majors. Students with an undecided major have the lowest mean score for anxiety (98.60), while students with an education major have the highest mean score (118.25). The mean scores of majors in Economics (Business), East Asian studies and Chinese are relatively low (103.32 to107.85),

while the mean scores of majors in Science, Social Science, Humanities and Medical Science are relatively high (111.58 to115.89).

Table 5.26 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by Educational Levels and Majors

Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
Freshman-Sophomore	42	111.0714	9.9594	1.5368	87.00	134.00
Junior-Senior	59	110.0678	15.1690	1.9748	58.00	145.00
Graduate	22	108.8182	17.0898	3.6436	78.00	137.00
Other	10	110.5000	19.2426	6.0850	89.00	142.00
Total	133	110.2105	14.2898	1.2391	58.00	145.00
Major or specialty						
Chinese	7	107.8571	16.3343	6.1738	87.00	124.00
Humanities	27	114.6296	15.5245	2.9877	58.00	142.00
Social Science	15	114.4000	9.5603	2.4685	91.00	133.00
Medical Science	9	115.8889	13.1096	4.3699	101.00	145.00
Education	4	118.2500	12.5000	6.2500	112.00	137.00
Science	19	111.5789	13.6883	3.1403	78.00	134.00
East Asian Studies	26	106.5385	15.3212	3.0047	58.00	130.00
Economics, Business	19	103.3158	12.9703	2.9756	89.00	133.00
Undecided	5	98.6000	8.7636	3.9192	89.00	105.00
Total	131	110.1374	14.3868	1.2570	58.00	145.00

The FLCAS Scores of Subgroups by Chinese Language Learning Experience

Table 5.27 shows that the mean anxiety scores consistently increase among the four groups as the age of starting to learn Chinese increases. The mean FLCAS scores among the subgroups based on years of learning Chinese and based on hours spent weekly to learn Chinese outside of class display mixed pictures.

The ANOVA tests show no significant differences in the anxiety levels among the subgroups based on the ages of staring to learn Chinese, the years of learning Chinese and the time of studying Chinese outside of class.

Table 5.27 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by Chinese Language Learning Experience

Age to learn Chinese	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
Group1 (1-13)	15	106.6667	12.7373	3.2887	89.00	133.00
Group 2 (14-18)	54	109.6111	12.7345	1.7329	58.00	134.00
Group 3 (19-24)	57	110.6491	15.4012	2.0399	58.00	145.00
Group 4 (25-39)	6	120.3333	19.8561	8.1062	94.00	142.00
Years of learning Chinese						
Less than one year	40	112.3750	15.2074	2.4045	87.00	145.00
One or two years	58	108.9310	14.9101	1.9578	58.00	130.00
Three or four years	19	110.4737	13.1756	3.0227	89.00	137.00
More than five years	15	109.0667	11.4484	2.9560	89.00	123.00
Study outside of class						
Less than 5 hours	20	107.5500	12.6428	2.8270	89.00	145.00
5 to 10 hours	52	109.5000	16.1846	2.2444	58.00	137.00
11 to 15 hours	36	113.7778	8.3977	1.3996	94.00	126.00
16 to 20 hours	15	109.5333	16.3658	4.2256	87.00	142.00
More than 20 hours	10	107.4000	20.0787	6.3495	58.00	122.00

The FLCAS Scores of Subgroups by Other Foreign Language Learning Experience

It is surprising to see as expressed in Table 5.28 that the mean anxiety scores consistently decrease among the three age groups (1-10, 11-18, and 19 up) as the age of starting to learn other foreign languages increases, although the results of the ANOVA show no significant differences. Comparing the scores of those who responded to the question about learning other foreign languages,

those who had studied one other foreign language have a higher mean anxiety score than those who had not studied any other foreign languages, but a lower mean score than those who had studied two and more other foreign languages. Again, the ANOVA tests show no significant differences in anxiety levels among the subgroups based on learning other foreign languages.

Table 5.28 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by Other Foreign Language Learning Experience

Age to start learning other languages	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Group 1 (1-10)	**19**	**113.7895**	**9.9643**	**2.2860**	**101.00**	**134.00**
Group 2 (11-18)	**61**	**110.8033**	**14.7375**	**1.8869**	**58.00**	**145.00**
Group 3 (19 up)	**31**	**107.3871**	**15.3160**	**2.7508**	**78.00**	**133.00**
Other languages						
No	**18**	**108.4444**	**16.1545**	**3.8076**	**58.00**	**125.00**
One	**85**	**111.0588**	**13.7973**	**1.4965**	**58.00**	**145.00**
Two and more	**30**	**108.8667**	**14.8039**	**2.7028**	**78.00**	**137.00**
Languages studied						
French	**42**	**108.3571**	**14.9908**	**2.3131**	**78.00**	**142.00**
German	**12**	**106.3333**	**22.3295**	**6.4460**	**58.00**	**137.00**
Latin	**3**	**116.3333**	**8.0829**	**4.6667**	**107.00**	**121.00**
Spanish	**50**	**112.7600**	**10.2032**	**1.4429**	**89.00**	**145.00**
Japanese	**4**	**106.5000**	**21.7945**	**10.8972**	**89.00**	**134.00**
Korean	**2**	**121.0000**	**.0000**	**.0000**	**121.00**	**121.00**
Other languages	**2**	**112.0000**	**7.0711**	**5.0000**	**107.00**	**117.00**

Among the subgroups based on other foreign languages studied, the Korean group has the highest mean score (121.00), while both the German and the Japanese groups have the lowest mean scores (106.33 and 106.50). The mean score of the Latin group was a slightly higher than the French and the Spanish groups.

The FLCAS Scores of Subgroups by Goals for Learning Chinese and Enjoyment of Chinese Learning

Table 5.29 shows that the students whose goal for learning Chinese was to become fluent in speaking, listening, reading and writing have lower mean anxiety scores than those students who wanted to become fluent in speaking and listening only (109.00 versus 112.56). The reason for this difference might be the former subgroup is more confident in their Chinese learning and that is why they choose a much more difficult and higher goal. Table 5.29 also shows that students who enjoyed learning Chinese have lower mean scores than those students who did not (109.85 versus 113.08). However, the ANOVA for Goals for Learning Chinese and the T-test for Enjoyment of Chinese Learning showed no significant differences.

Table 5.29 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by Goals for Learning Chinese and Enjoyment of Chinese Learning

Goals of learning Chinese	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Reading and writing	**1**	**109.0000**	**.**	**.**	**109.00**	**109.00**
Speaking and listening	**30**	**112.5667**	**16.5814**	**3.0273**	**78.00**	**145.00**
Both	**102**	**109.5294**	**13.6307**	**1.3496**	**58.00**	**137.00**
Enjoying learning Chinese						
No	**13**	**113.0769**	**16.1269**	**4.4728**	**91.00**	**145.00**
Yes	**117**	**109.8462**	**14.2941**	**1.3215**	**58.00**	**142.00**

The FLCAS Scores of Subgroups by Self-Perspectives on Language Learning and Chinese Proficiency

Interestingly, the mean anxiety score consistently increases among the four subgroups ("Poor", "Fair", "Good" and "Excellent") based on self-

perceived levels of Chinese proficiency (Table 5.30). The "Excellent" subgroup has the highest level of anxiety while the "Poor" subgroup has the lowest level of anxiety. The result of the one-way ANOVA test shows that a significant difference exists among the "Excellent", "Good" "Fair", and "Poor" subgroups (F=7.443, p< .001). Tukey's HSD indicates that the anxiety level in the "Excellent" subgroup is significantly higher than that in the "Fair" and "Poor" subgroups (p< .05 and p< .001), while the anxiety level in the "Good" subgroup is significantly higher than that in the "Fair" and "Poor" subgroups (p< .05 and p< .05) and the anxiety level in the "Fair" subgroup is significantly higher than that in the "Poor" subgroup (p< .05) (Tables 5.31 and 5.32).

The phenomena that anxiety levels increase as self-perceptions of Chinese proficiency level increase seems contrary to the findings of several studies regarding to self-perceived language proficiency and anxiety levels (Gardner et al., 1984; Foss & Reitzel, 1988; Pintrich & Degroot, 1990, Kondo, 1999). These studies indicated that low levels of self-perceived language proficiency and lack of self-confidence increase anxiety levels. The opposite finding in this study might result from the subjects' over-optimism and strong self-confidence with respect to their perceived Chinese proficiency. For the question "How do you rate your overall proficiency in Chinese language as compared with the proficiency of other students in your class?," fully 64% of the subjects answered with "Excellent" or "Good." Only 6.0% of the subjects chose "Poor" (Please see Table #). The subjects' answers obviously show that they have extremely optimistic views about their Chinese language proficiency. Group A shows more optimism and self-confidence on self-perceived Chinese proficiency than Group B and Group C (18% "Excellent" answers versus 5.0% for Group B and none in Group C). Perhaps extremely over-optimistic self-perceptions of language proficiency increase the anxiety level of the subjects in this study since irrational optimism easily lead to fractured feelings when facing with reality.

None of the subjects chose "Excellent" to the question "How do you rate your overall proficiency in Chinese language as compared with the proficiency of native speakers of Chinese". Among the three subgroups based on their answers, the "Good" subgroup has the lowest level of anxiety and the "Fair" subgroup has the highest level of the anxiety, while the "Poor" subgroup is in the middle. However, the ANOVA shows no significant differences among the three subgroups.

Table 5.30 Descriptive Statistics of FLCAS Scores by Self-Perspectives on Chinese Proficiency

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Proficiency in the class						
Excellent	**15**	**120.1333**	**12.1177**	**3.1288**	**105.00**	**142.00**
Good	**71**	**110.4930**	**14.5060**	**1.7215**	**58.00**	**145.00**
Fair	**39**	**109.4872**	**10.9853**	**1.7591**	**89.00**	**134.00**
Poor	**8**	**92.6250**	**15.1463**	**5.3550**	**58.00**	**104.00**
Proficiency with natives						
Good	**7**	**104.2857**	**14.5569**	**5.5020**	**89.00**	**125.00**
Fair	**35**	**114.3143**	**9.3958**	**1.5882**	**89.00**	**137.00**
Poor	**91**	**109.0879**	**15.5389**	**1.6289**	**58.00**	**145.00**

Table 5.31 ANOVA of FLCAS Scores by Self-Perspectives on Chinese Proficiency

		Sum Squares	ofdf	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Chinese proficiency in the class	**Between Groups**	**3977.007**	**3**	**1325.669**	**7.443**	**.000**
	Within Groups	**22977.098**	**129**	**178.117**		
	Total	**26954.105**	**132**			
Chinese proficiency compared with natives	**Between Groups**	**949.837**	**2**	**474.919**	**2.374**	**.097**
	Within Groups	**26004.268**	**130**	**200.033**		
	Total	**26954.105**	**132**			

Table 5.32 Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons of FLCAS Scores by Self-Perspectives on Chinese Proficiency

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Chinese proficiency in the class	Excellent	Good	9.6404	3.7925	.054
		Fair	10.6462*	4.0548	.043
		Poor	27.5083*	5.8429	.000
	Good	Excellent	-9.6404	3.7925	.054
		Fair	1.0058	2.6600	.982
		Poor	17.8680*	4.9773	.002
	Fair	Excellent	-10.6462*	4.0548	.043
		Good	-1.0058	2.6600	.982
		Poor	16.8622*	5.1799	.006
	Poor	Excellent	-27.5083*	5.8429	.000
		Good	-17.8680*	4.9773	.002
		Fair	-16.8622*	5.1799	.006
Chinese proficiency compared with natives	Good	Fair	-10.0286	5.8559	.200
		Poor	-4.8022	5.5475	.662
	Fair	Good	10.0286	5.8559	.200
		Poor	5.2264	2.8131	.151
	Poor	Good	4.8022	5.5475	.662
		Fair	-5.2264	2.8131	.151

Factor Analysis of the BALLI

The BALLI's five areas (the Difficulty of Language Learning, Foreign Language Aptitude, the Nature of Language, Learning and Communication Strategy and Motivation and Expectation) were categorized based on logical

analysis (Horwitz, 1987). In order to explore the internal structure and produce statistical meaningful categories of the BALLI and thus to better understand the beliefs of the participants about language learning and learning Chinese in China, a factor analysis (principle components analysis) of the BALLI items was preformed. In this way, the present results can be compared more easily with the results of other belief studies. The thirty-four items of the BALLI went though correlation matrix, factor extraction, and rotation procedures. The factor analysis was used to extract the factors, which was followed by oblique (promax) rotation. Scree test and the eigenvalues of greater than 1.0 were used for extracting the factors. A discussion of the similarities and differences of the factors from this study and from other studies follows.

Factor Analysis of the BALLI as A Whole Group

Based on the principle component analysis, fourteen factors with eigenvalues of one were obtained. A Scree plot procedure was used to select factors that significantly represented the total variance. The Scree test indicated five factors representing the data most appropriately.

Factor 1: Motivation and Aptitude in Learning Foreign Language

Twelve items loaded above .40 constitute Factor 1. The unusually large number of items with highly loaded numbers and the relatively concentrated and meaningful contents make Factor 1 a strong factor. Items 31, 29, 24, 32 and 12 are specific about the motivation to learn Chinese. The five items are well related to each other, including both instrumental and integrative motivations towards learning Chinese and studying Chinese in China. Items 29 and 12 express the strong will to "learn to speak Chinese well" and to learn Chinese in China. The

factor also includes Item 24 "I would like to learn Chinese so that I can get to know Chinese people better" and Item 32 "I would like to have Chinese friends". These items manifest integrative motivation for speaking Chinese well. Item 29 "If I learn Chinese very well, I will have better opportunities for a good job" obviously explains the instrumental motivation are also included in this factor.

Table 5.33 Factor 1: Motivation and Aptitude in Learning Foreign Language

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
3. Some languages are easier to learn than others.	**.755**	**1.66**	**.89**
31. I want to learn to speak Chinese well.	**.753**	**1.30**	**.79**
18. It is important to repeat and practice a lot.	**.751**	**1.68**	**.83**
27. Learning a foreign language is different than learning other academic subjects	**.718**	**1.89**	**.91**
1. It is easier for children than adults to learn a foreign language.	**.678**	**1.56**	**.95**
2. Some people have a special ability for learning foreign languages.	**.677**	**1.83**	**.92**
29. If I learn Chinese very well, I will have better opportunities for a good job.	**.663**	**1.97**	**.98**
12. It is best to learn Chinese in an Chinese speaking country.	**.662**	**1.72**	**.93**
24. I would like to learn Chinese so that I can get to know Chinese people better.	**.580**	**12.15**	**.84**
32. I would like to have Chinese friends.	**.566**	**1.79**	**.89**
9. You shouldn't say anything in Chinese until you can say it correctly	**-.529**	**4.09**	**1.06**
10. It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one.	**.434**	**2.48**	**1.00**

Items 2, 3 and 10 directly concern foreign language aptitude. They address the aptitude of children and adults, the special ability some people have and the experience of other foreign language learning. Items 3 and 27 respectively belong to the Difficulty of Language Learning and the Nature of Language Learning categories. However, these two items can also be regarded as related to the other three aptitude items, because they discuss the differences between children and adults in learning foreign languages, special abilities for foreign language learning and functions of previous other foreign language learning experience. Item 3 loaded the highest on this factor and Item 27 was the fourth in Factor 1. These two items seem to play a somewhat connecting role for the whole factor, especially between motivation and aptitude.

Factor 2: The Nature and Characteristics of Learning Chinese

Factor 2 includes Items 22, 34, 28, 21, 23, 30 and 8. It primarily addresses the Nature and Characteristics of Learning Chinese. Among them, Item 28, 23, and 8 appeared in Category 2 (the Nature of Language Learning) of Horwitz's logical categories. These three items view the Nature and Characteristics of Learning Chinese from the perspectives of the relationships of learning Chinese with the native language, learning Chinese grammar and learning Chinese culture. Item 22 " If beginning students are permitted to make errors in Chinese, it will be difficult for them to speak correctly later on" and Item 34 "It is easier to read and write Chinese than to speak and understand it" loaded highest on Factor 2. This implies that these two items play a key role in this factor. Although they belong respectively to Category 1 (the Difficulty of Language Learning) and Category 3 (Learning and Communication Strategy) in Horwitz's logical categories, they relate to the Characteristics of Chinese here. Chinese's unique pronunciation system, especially the tones, makes the Chinese language learners especially difficult to speak correctly. The alphabetic Pinyin, phonetic notation

and other pronunciation system, simplified and traditional ideography characters classic and modern Chinese as well as modern and traditional Chinese culture also make Chinese complicated and difficult to understand. Because of the unique characteristics of Chinese pronunciation system and culture, Item 21, "I feel timid speaking Chinese", makes sense.

Table 5.34 Factor 2: The Nature and Characteristics of Learning Chinese

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
22. If beginning students are permitted to make errors in Chinese, it will be difficult for them to speak correctly later on.	**.645**	**3.10**	**1.22**
34. It is easier to read and write Chinese than to speak and understand it.	**.614**	**3.36**	**1.28**
28. The most important part of learning Chinese is learning how to translate from my native language.	**.539**	**3.53**	**.93**
21. I feel timid speaking Chinese with other people.	**.516**	**3.02**	**1.15**
23. The most important part of learning a foreign language is learning the grammar.	**.512**	**2.89**	**.96**
30. People who speak more than one language are very intelligent.	**.468**	**2.92**	**.65**
8. It is necessary to know about Chinese cultures in order to learn to speak Chinese well.	**.466**	**2.49**	**.91**

Factor 3: Self-efficacy and Strategies used in Learning Spoken Chinese

Factor 3 has two parts. One is self-efficacy in learning spoken Chinese, including Items 4, 33, 5, and 16. Items 7 and 26 are about the strategies for

learning spoken Chinese. Items 4 and 5 are tightly connected and related to self-confidence when facing the difficulty of learning Chinese. Items 33 and 16 express strong self-efficacy from the aptitude of other people and self respectively. Items 7 and 26 explore the strategies for learning spoken Chinese.

Table 5.35 Factor 3: Self-efficacy and Strategies used in Learning Spoken Chinese

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
4. The difficult levels of Chinese.	**-.650**	**1.93**	**.75**
33. Everyone can learn to speak a foreign language.	**.572**	**2.26**	**.99**
7. It is important to speak Chinese with excellent pronunciation.	**.486**	**1.79**	**.93**
5. I believe that I will ultimately learn to speak this language very well	**.420**	**2.09**	**.90**
16. I have a special ability for learning foreign languages	**.407**	**3.12**	**.86**
26.* It is important to practice with cassettes or tapes.	**-.381**	**2.96**	**.90**

*It is near .4 and meaningful.

Factor 4: Perspectives on Foreign Language Learners

Factor 4 concerns Perspectives on Foreign Language Learners, which includes Items 11, 20 and 19. One is the perspective on people who are good at mathematics or science in foreign language learning and the other a comparison of women with men in foreign language learning. The third item concerns how speaking Chinese is viewed by the people in their own country.

Table 5.36 Factor 4: Perspectives on Foreign Language Learners

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
11. People who are good at mathematics or science are not good at learning foreign languages	**.538**	**4.08**	**.83**
20. People in my country feel that it is important to speak Chinese.	**.465**	**3.45**	**1.16**
19. Women are better than men at learning foreign languages.	**.425**	**3.65**	**.90**

Factor 5: The Difficulty of Chinese and Strategies for Learning Chinese

Factor 5 can be described as the Difficulty of Chinese and Strategies for Learning Chinese. Items 5 and 25 deal with the difficulty of foreign language learning. The first item is about the time requirement for learning foreign languages and the second is about judging the relative difficulty of speaking and

Table 5.37 Factor 5: The Difficulty of Chinese and Strategies for Learning Chinese

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
15. How long would it take foreign learners to speak the language very well?	**-.636**	**3.70**	**1.01**
14. It's O.K. to guess if you don't know a word in Chinese.	**.462**	**2.32**	**1.17**
13. I enjoy practicing Chinese with Chinese people that I meet.	**.446**	**1.81**	**.90**
25.* It is easier to speak than understand a foreign language.	**.353**	**3.54**	**1.08**

*It is near .4 and meaningful

understanding a foreign language. The strategies for learning Chinese here deal more with general Chinese learning, while the strategies for learning Chinese in Factor 3 concern spoken Chinese more specifically. Item 14 is about guessing the meaning of unknown words and Item 25 is about practicing Chinese with Chinese people. The two items apply to both the situations of learning spoken and written Chinese, but Item 14 deals with written Chinese while Item 25 seems to deal with spoken Chinese more.

Comparison with Other Studies

The factors found in this study include Motivation and Aptitude in Learning Foreign Languages, the Nature and Characteristics of Learning Chinese, Self-Efficacy and Strategies for Learning Spoken Chinese, Perspectives on Foreign Language Learners, and the Difficulty of Chinese and Strategies for Learning Chinese. In order to see how similar and different the factors from previous studies and this one, a comparison of the factors in this study with other studies is useful. The factors used in comparison are from five studies of EFL learners (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kunt, 1997 and Kim-Yoon, 2000) and one study of learners of Japanese in the U.S. (Oh, 1996).

This current study found five factors, which cover all five areas of Horwitz' logical categories. However, the order of the factors and structure of the content have obvious differences. None of the six previous studies found factors covering all five areas of Horwitz's logical categories. The factors in this study also show some important differences in structure and content from the factors found in the other studies. In the six previous studies, all have four factors, except for Truitt's study of Korean EFL learners, which has five factors. Among the six studies, four of them included motivation as a part of a factor. In Truitt's study, motivation is the fifth factor. It is the second factor for one of three

groups in Kim-Yoon's studies. Only Oh's study of learners of Japanese in the U.S. and Park's study of Korean EFL learners included motivation as a part of the first factor. However, unlike this study, none of them combine motivation with aptitude in foreign language learning. In Park's study, the combination was motivational beliefs and beliefs about formal English. Oh's study showed a combination of motivation and confidence in speaking Japanese. The category of Motivation and Expectation has only five items and is the smallest category in Horwitz's BALLI. The special combination of motivation with aptitude, the large number of items (12 items) and the highly loaded data in the first factor of this study is unusual and meaningful. This combination likely shows that the participants in this study are more motivated and aptitude-oriented than the learners in the previous studies. Their strong motivations seems to not only combine instrumental and integrative motivations, but also to highly correlate with general aptitude and their own specific aptitude of foreign language learning It is understandable that learning a less commonly taught foreign language like Chinese and going to a country with a completely different social system and culture requires strong motivation and special aptitude. Besides this study, Oh's study of learners of Japanese in the U.S. also showed motivation as a part of the first factor, which might suggest that the rank of strong motivation might be related to the degree of difficulty of particular languages and learning situations.

Factor 2, the Nature and Characteristics of Learning Chinese, includes 7 items. Three items (28, 23 and 8) come from the Nature of Language Learning, the third area of Horwitz's logical categories. However, the three items reported here not only concern the nature of language learning, but also relate to the special characteristics of learning Chinese. These items explore the characteristics of learning Chinese from the perspectives of the importance of translating from the native language, learning grammar and cultural awareness. Concerning if beginning students are permitted to make errors in speaking Chinese and if reading and writing Chinese is easier than speaking and understanding it, Items

22, 34, and 21 are also related to special characteristics of Chinese, even though these items come from the different areas of the original logical categories. Four of the previous six studies had Value and Nature of Learning English in either Factor 1 or Factor 2. Truitt (1995), Kunt (1997) and Kim-Yoon (2000) had it in Factor 1. Yang's (1992) study had this item in Factor 2. It is worth noting that the only two studies (Park, 1995 and Oh, 1996) without a factor related to the value and nature of foreign language learning are also the only two that included motivation as an important part of Factor 1. More interestingly, Factor 2 "Importance of Formal Learning" and Factor 4 "Importance of Correctness" in Oh's study can actually be regarded as dealing with the special characteristics of learning Japanese too, based on the content of the two factors. The similarity of both Factor 1 and Factor 2 in this study and Oh's study likely indicates that there might be some kind of special affinity between learners of Chinese and Japanese, because these two less commonly taught foreign languages have some similarity of language systems and cultures. The high rank of the factor "the Value and Nature of Learning English" and the low rank for the factor of "Motivation" in almost all the studies of EFL learners, with the exception of park's study, might also have some special correlation and inherent structure among EFL learners.

Factor 3 in this study is a combination of self-efficacy and strategies for learning spoken Chinese. Items 4, 33, 5 and 16 express self-efficacy and Items 7 and 26 address specific strategies. Four of the six previous studies (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995 and Kunt 1997) also have a factor combining self-efficacy with something else, such as expectation, social interaction or confidence. None of these studies, however, combined self-efficacy and strategies for learning foreign language. It is also surprising to note that none of the six studies included Learning and Communication Strategies as a factor or a part of a factor. The combination of self-efficacy and strategies for learning spoken Chinese in this study is somewhat unusual, because not only is the content of this factor different from the other studies, but also because of its

emphasis on specific spoken language learning activities. The distinct combination found here relates to the special characteristics of Chinese, goals for learning Chinese and the situation of learning Chinese in China. The unique Chinese language system, especially pronunciation, the goal focusing on oral communication and study-abroad situation likely make the students in this study pay more attention to strategies used in learning spoken Chinese.

Factor 4, Perspectives on Foreign Language Learners, includes Items 11, 20 and 19. No previous studies found the same or similar factor or component of a factor. The subjects in this study might have more awareness about foreign language learners, because of the language they learn and the learning situation they face.

Factor 5 is the Difficulty of Chinese and Strategies for Learning Chinese. Among this factor's five items, Items 15 and 25 and Items 14 and 13 come respectively from two logical categories (the Difficulty of Language Learning and Learning and Communication Strategy). Interestingly, like the strategies discussed above, no previous study included the difficulty of language learning as a factor or part of a factor. Once again, the data of this study display a unique combination. Just like Factor 3, the combination in Factor 5 might also stem from the special characteristics of Chinese and the situation of learning Chinese in China.

Three Factor Analyses of the FLCAS

The FLCAS was developed by Horwitz (1983, 1986). Since then, it has become a standard scale for measuring learners' foreign language classroom anxiety, although some studies have used a modified FLCAS (Young, 1986; Lee, 1992; Truitt, 1995; Oh, 1996; Kunt, 1997; Yan, 1998; Onwuegbuzie et al., 1999; Qian, 1999; Coulombe, 2000; Casado et al, 2001; Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002). No previous studies using the FLCAS have performed factor analysis of the scale. Horwitz's FLCAS was based on three related performance anxieties: 1)

communication apprehension; 2) test anxiety, and 3) fear negative evaluation (Horwitz et al, 1986). In order to further explore the nature of the FLCAS, a factor analysis of the FLCAS would be useful. Thus, this study did three factor analyses based on the Non-Asia, Asian and Chinese background groups and tried to find the similarities and differences by comparing the factors found among the three ethnic groups.

As the previous descriptive analysis of the FLCAS showed, the total scores of the FLCAS for Group A, Group B and Group C were 110.05, 111.15 and 110.03 respectively. The ANOVA and Tukey HSD analyses showed no significant differences among the three groups. However, the factor analyses of the three groups paint a different picture. The factor analyses of the FLCAS among the three groups show that each of the three ethnic groups can be summarized in six factors, but the contents and orders of the factors have some important differences. The factors found for the three groups by the factor analyses are as follows:

Anxiety Factors

Group A Factors

1. Nervousness and Tension in Chinese Class
2. Self-consciousness in Speaking Chinese
3. Ease in Chinese Class
4. Pressure from Chinese Class
5. Worry about Lagging Behind Other Students
6. Frustrated Feeling in Chinese Class

Group B Factors

1. Fear in Interaction with Chinese Teachers and Other Students
2. Self-consciousness in Learning Chinese
3. Worry about Lagging Behind in Chinese Class

4. Self-consciousness in speaking Chinese
5. Ease in Chinese Class
6. Frustrated Feeling in Chinese Class

Group C Factors

1. Nervousness in speaking Chinese in Chinese Class
2. Fear in Interaction with Teachers of Chinese
3. Fear in Interaction with Other Students in Chinese Class
4. Ease in Chinese Class
5. Worry about Lagging Behind Teaching Process of Chinese
6. Confidence in Interaction with the Native Speakers

FLCAS Factor 1

Factor 1 for Group A, Group B and Group C is Nervousness and Tension in Chinese Class, Fear in Interaction with Chinese Teachers and Other Students and Nervousness in speaking Chinese in Chinese Class, respectively. The three groups show differences not only with respect to the contents of Factor 1 but also with respect to the number of items associated with the contents. Factor 1 for Group B has an unusually large number of items (13) and Group A and Group C have 9 items and 6 items respectively. The content of the items in Factor 1 for each group is reported in Table 5.38 (a), (b) and (c).

For Group A, Factor 1 displays nervousness and tension in various areas of Chinese class. The nervousness and tension are expressed in speaking Chinese, interacting with teachers, feeling nervous about falling behind and being unprepared for the class. Factor 1 for Group B focuses on Fear in Interaction with the Chinese Teacher and Other Students. This factor seems to be a very strong factor for Group B, since there are 13 items associated with it. Items 31 and 24 specifically deal with fear in interaction with students, while Items 29, 33,

and 19 involve fear interaction with teachers. Items 3, 13, 20, 16 and 27 concern fear in interaction with both students and teachers at the same time. Factor 1 for Group C has the fewest items and all six items seem to focus on feelings about speaking Chinese in class.

Table 5.38 (a) Group A's Factor 1:
Nervousness and Tension in Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in my Chinese class.	.856	4.03	1.13
3. I tremble when I know that I' m going to be called on in my Chinese class	.849	4.12	1.12
4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in the Chinese class.	.711	3.61	1.11
16. Even if I am well prepared for Chinese class, I feel anxious about it.	.672	3.79	1.23
29. I get nervous when I don't understand every word the Chinese teacher says.	.636	3.80	1.01
25. Chinese class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.	.594	3.36	1.28
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in Chinese class.	.592	3.66	1.08
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my Chinese class.	.550	3.88	1.17
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my Chinese class than in my other classes.	.500	3.37	1.31

Table 5.38 (b) Group B's Factor 1:

Fear in Interaction with Chinese Teachers and Other Students

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak Chinese.	.879	3.95	1.36
29. I get nervous when I don't understand every word the Chinese teacher says.	.869	3.95	.89
3. I tremble when I know that I' m going to be called on in my Chinese class.	.838	3.95	1.15
33. I get nervous when the Chinese teacher asks questions, which I haven't prepared in advance.	.832	3.60	1.19
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my	.831	4.00	.92
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in my Chinese class.	.768	3.95	1.15
16. Even if I am well prepared for Chinese class, I feel anxious about it.	.757	3.65	.88
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in my Chinese class.	-.727	2.65	1.18
26. When I am on my way to Chine class, I feel very sure and relaxed.	-.656	2.60	1.05
27. I get nervous and confused when 1 am speaking in my Chinese class	.637	4.00	.97
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking Chinese in front of other students.	.586	3.60	.99
19. I am afraid that my Chinese teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.	.584	3.60	1.14
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my Chinese class.	.397	3.55	.83

Table 5.38 (c) Group C's Factor 1:

Nervousness in speaking Chinese in Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
27. I get nervous and confused when 1am speaking in my Chinese class	.734	3.70	1.00
1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my Chinese class.	.729	3.00	1.08
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in Chinese class.	.720	3.32	.82
23. I always feel that the other students speak the Chinese language better than I do.	.652	3.24	1.21
18. I feel confident when I speak in my Chinese class.	-.572	2.68	.91
19. I am afraid that my Chinese teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.	.458	3.83	.98

Based on their ethnic language and culture, the three groups' different contents for Factor 1 make sense. It is natural for Group A to have various different ethnic language and cultural background and study a less commonly taught foreign language in the target language country. Thus, they have more cultural shock and conflicts in various areas than Group B and Group C. It is worth noting that Group B has a large number of items regarding fear in a relatively narrow area -- interaction with teachers and other students. Compared with Western culture, East Asian culture has traits of shyness, inwardness and feelings of nervousness and tension in Chinese class, since they have a strong other-orientation. These traits are expressed even more in Japanese culture (Chang, 1997; Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000). It is likely that these traits of East Asian culture make Fear in Interaction with Chinese Teachers and Other Students as Factor 1 for Group B. Like Group B, the contents of Factor 1 for Group C are also narrow but focus on speaking Chinese in class. Overall, the

narrow area and fewest items in Factor 1 for Group C suggest that Group C likely might have less anxiety than Group A and Group B.

FLCAS Factor 2

Factor 2 for both Group A and Group B concerns self-consciousness. However, the self-consciousness in Group A is focused on speaking Chinese while the self-consciousness in Group B concerns learning Chinese. The contents

Table 5.39 (a) Group A's Factor 2:
Self-consciousness in Speaking Chinese

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
14. I would not be nervous speaking the Chinese language with native speakers	-.846	2.88	1.17
32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speaks of Chinese.	-.755	2.87	1.09
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking Chinese in front of other students.	.666	3.62	1.31
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in my Chinese class.	-.647	2.89	1.28
33. I get nervous when the Chinese teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.	.615	3.53	1.14
18. I feel confident when I speak in my Chinese class.	-.604	3.30	1.14
27. I get nervous and confused when 1 am speaking in my Chinese class.	.581	3.61	1.26
28. When I am on my way to Chinese class, I feel very sure and relaxed.	-.499	2.50	1.00
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my Chinese class.	.490	3.53	1.38

Table 5.39 (b) Group B's Factor 2:

Self-consciousness in Learning Chinese

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
12. In Chinese class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.	.937	3.50	1.00
8. I am usually at ease during tests in my Chinese class.	-.880	2.25	.85
17. I often feel like not going to my Chinese class.	.785	3.65	1.04
1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my Chinese class.	.694	3.10	1.25
14. I would not be nervous speaking the Chinese language with native speakers	-.631	3.15	1.23
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at Chinese than I am.	.616	3.10	1.17
6. During Chinese class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.	.471	2.95	.89

of Factor 2 for Group A seem to be narrower than that of Group B, but the factor is associated with more items than that of Group B. The strong narrow contents focusing on speaking Chinese likely indicates that Group A pays more attention to speaking Chinese. It might also relate to their goal for learning Chinese, since Group A is the only group with a large number of students whose goal for learning Chinese is only listening and speaking. It is worth noting that the focus on speaking Chinese in Factor 2 for Group A is likely different from the same focus in Factor 1 for Group C ("Nervousness in speaking Chinese in Chinese Class"). For Group A, the focus is not just on speaking Chinese in Chinese class, but also on speaking Chinese with native speakers, including nervous consciousness and other types of self-consciousnesses. Five of 7 items in Factor 2 for Group C (Items 29, 33, 4, 3, and 15) seem to be directly involved in

interaction with teachers of Chinese. The other 2 items address interaction with teachers indirectly through taking tests and making mistakes in the class.

Table 5.39 (c) Group C's Factor 2:
Fear in Interaction with Teachers of Chinese

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
8. I am usually at ease during tests in my Chinese class.	**-.781**	**2.68**	**1.08**
29. I get nervous when I don't understand every word the Chinese teacher says.	**.687**	**3.46**	**.93**
33. I get nervous when the Chinese teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.	**.645**	**3.32**	**1.03**
4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in the Chinese class.	**.600**	**3.38**	**1.21**
3. I tremble when I know that I' m going to be called on in my Chinese class.	**.585**	**3.78**	**1.25**
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in my Chinese class	**-.561**	**2.95**	**1.18**
15. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.	**.542**	**2.92**	**.86**

FLCAS Factor 3

Factor 3 for Group A, Group B and Group C can be labeled as Ease in Chinese Class, Worry about Lagging Behind in Chinese Class and Fear in Interaction with Other Students in Chinese Class, respectively. The contents of Factor 3 among the three groups are quite different. Like Group A, the other two groups also have a factor of Ease in Chinese Class, but the factor is ranked as Factor 4 for Group C and Factor 5 for Group B. Since Ease in Chinese Class is ranked as Factor 3 for Group A, Group A might feel a little more relaxed in

Table 5.40 (a) Group A's Factor 3:

Ease in Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
17. I often feel like not going to my Chinese class.	.823	3.30	1.44
6. During Chinese class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.	.727	2.88	1.21
8. I am usually at ease during tests in my Chinese class.	-.635	2.88	1.01
21. The more I study for a Chinese test, the more confused I get.	.554	4.22	.99

Table 5.40 (b) Group B's Factor 3:

Worry about Lagging Behind in Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
25. Chinese class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind	.882	2.00	.97
15. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.	.727	3.30	3.92
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in Chinese class.	.706	3.15	1.27
23. I always feel that the other students speak the Chinese language better than I do.	.629	3.40	1.31

Chinese class than Group B or Group C. All items in Factor 3 for Group B seem to describe worry about lagging behind. Compared with the other items in the factor, Items 25 and 23 are more directly concerned with lagging behind in Chinese class and the other students. The other two groups also worry about lagging behind as a factor, but the factor is ranked as Factor 4 for both Group A and Group C and its contents are narrower in comparison with Group B. Factor

3 of Group C is once again about fear of interaction, but this time the fear of interaction is specifically with other students in Chinese class.

Table 5.40 (c) Group C's Factor 3:
Fear in Interaction with Other Students in Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
12. In Chinese class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.	**.772**	**3.65**	**.98**
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak Chinese.	**.751**	**4.16**	**.73**
21. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for my language class.	**.676**	**4.27**	**.69**
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my Chinese class.	**.658**	**3.76**	**.98**
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in my Chinese class.	**.641**	**4.06**	**.97**
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my Chinese class than in my other classes.	**.598**	**3.84**	**.93**
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking Chinese in front of other students.	**.567**	**3.46**	**1.02**

FLCAS Factor 4

As was the case for Factor 3, Factor 4 for the three groups also shows some obvious differences. Factor 4 for Group A, Group B and Group C is Pressure from Chinese Class, Self-consciousness in Speaking Chinese and Ease in Chinese Class. There are 4 items in Factor 4 for Group A and two of them (Items 19 and 31) deal with pressure from interaction with teachers and other students of Chinese. The other two items (22 and 30) are related to pressure from the

difficulty of learning spoken Chinese and unpreparedness in Chinese class. Group C has more items on Ease in Chinese Class and the contents of the factor also seem to be more relaxed in comparison with the same factor for Groups A and B. Compared with Group B Factor 2 (Self-consciousness in Learning Chinese), Factor 4 Self-consciousness in Speaking Chinese for Group B has fewer items and the contents are narrower.

Table 5.41 (a) Group A's Factor 4:
Pressure from Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
22. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for my language class.	.796	3.32	1.18
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak Chinese.	.641	3.74	.93
19. I am afraid that my Chinese teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make	.555	3.80	1.02
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak Chinese.	.481	4.20	1.01

Table 5.41 (b) Group B's Factor 4:
Self-consciousness in Speaking Chinese

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in the Chinese class.	.837	3.50	1.19
32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speaks of Chinese.	-.823	2.95	.83
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak Chinese.	.555	3.65	.99

Table 5.41 (c) Group C's Factor 4:

Ease in Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
28. When I am on my way to Chinese class, I feel very sure and relaxed.	-.775	2.84	.90
5. It wouldn't bother me at all to take more Chinese language classes.	-.742	2.27	.99
22. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for my language class.	.671	3.14	1.11
17. I often feel like not going to my Chinese class.	.619	3.35	1.14
6. During Chinese class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.	.521	3.11	1.13

FLCAS Factor 5

Factor 5 for Groups A, B and C are Worry about Lagging Behind Other Students, Ease in Chinese Class and Worry about Lagging Behind Teaching

Table 5.42 (a) Group A's Factor 5:

Worry about Lagging Behind Other Students

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
23. I always feel that the other students speak the Chinese language better than I do.	.701	3.08	1.37
11. I don't understand why some people get so upset over Chinese class.	-.682	3.39	.92
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at Chinese than I am.	.626	2.66	1.22
5. It wouldn't bother me at all to take more Chinese language classes.	.568	2.00	.91

Table 5.42 (b) Group B's Factor 5:

Ease in Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
5. It wouldn't bother me at all to take more Chinese language classes.	.906	2.00	.97
18. I feel confident when I speak in my Chinese class.	-.835	2.75	.64
11. I don't understand why some people get so upset over Chinese class.	.724	2.35	.75

Table 5.42 (c) Group C's Factor 5:

Worry about Lagging Behind Teaching Process of Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my Chinese class.	.838	3.73	1.07
16. Even if I am well prepared for Chinese class, I feel anxious about it.	.570	3.65	.89
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak Chinese.	.540	3.65	.86
25. Chinese class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.	.505	3.54	1.12

Process of Chinese Class. Interestingly, both Group A and Group C have a Factor 5 related to worry about lagging behind, but the contents of their worry differ. For Group A, the worry comes by comparison with other students in Chinese class while for Group C, the worry is mainly about the teaching process in Chinese class. Ease in Chinese Class as a factor for Group B is not only ranked the lowest among the same three factors for the three groups but also has the fewest items.

FLCAS Factor 6

Factor 6 for both Group A and Group B is Frustrated Feeling in Chinese Class, while for Group C is Confidence in Interaction with the Native Speakers. The contents of Factor 6 for Group A and Group B are different, although they have the same label. Group A shows more frustrated feelings and focuses on

Table 5.43 (a) Group A's Factor 6:
Frustrated Feeling in Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
15. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.	.681	2.71	1.23
1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my Chinese class.	.554	2.91	1.13
12. In Chinese class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.	.470	3.26	1.27

Table 5.43 (b) Group B's Factor 6:
Frustrated Feeling in Chinese Class

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
21. The more I study for a Chinese test, the more confused I get.	.840	4.15	1.04
22. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for my language class.	.794	3.60	.94
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my Chinese class than in my other classes.	.656	3.95	.69

self-performance in Chinese class. Group B's frustrated feelings deal with preparation for the Chinese class especially in comparison with other classes. It is worth noting that Interaction with the Native Speakers doesn't appear as a factor or even a part of the factor for Group A or Group B. It only appears for Group C, although it is only ranked as Factor 6. Items 14 and 32 demonstrate that Group C is confident in interactions with native speakers.

Table 5.43 (c) Group C's Factor 6:
Confidence in Interaction with the Native Speakers

Item	Loading	Mean	SD
14. I would not be nervous speaking the Chinese language with native speakers.	**.750**	**3.22**	**1.06**
32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speaks of Chinese.	**.735**	**2.84**	**.96**
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at Chinese than I am.	**-.602**	**2.92**	**1.28**
11. I don't understand why some people get so upset over Chinese class.	**.503**	**2.91**	**.92**

Discussion of the Similarity and Difference of the FLCAS Factors

As described above, the three ethnic group's factors display some similarities and differences according to both order and contents. In order to further explore the factors for the three groups, it is necessary to discuss the similarities and differences among them.

1. Nervousness in Chinese Class

Nervousness in Chinese Class plays a key role as Factor 1 for both Group A and Group C. However, Group A's feelings of Nervousness are more intense, wide spread and complicated than those of Group C. It includes 9 items versus 6 items for Group C. Factor 1 for Group A is mixed with some other negative feelings, such as tension, fear and embarrassment and connected to various class activities. Nervousness for Group C exclusively concerns speaking Chinese in Chinese class. It is natural for Group A to have such intense nervous feelings, since they are not only learning a less commonly taught foreign language in the target country but also facing a very different learning environment and culture, because of their ethnic backgrounds.

Group C's nervousness focusing on speaking Chinese in Chinese class is also understandable, because of some particular traits of their ethnic cultures. Although Group C has the same ethnic background and the learning environment in China is generally favorable for them, the shyness, inwardness and other-orientation of their ethnic culture likely make them nervous in speaking Chinese, even though they can generally speak Chinese better than students of other ethnic backgrounds (Chang, 1997; Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000). It is worth noting that Group B has a completely different Factor 1 and nervousness does not appear as an independent factor. The reason for this unusual phenomenon might be their ethnic backgrounds and the learning environment for them in China. Their similar ethnic languages and cultures and the types of Chinese programs and teaching methods in China in particular likely make them less nervous and more relaxed. As previously explained in the factor analysis of the BALLI, the Chinese programs and teaching methods used in China were originally designed for Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese students.

2. Fear in Interaction with Others

Both Group B and Group C include fear in interaction with others as important factors. For Group B, it is included in the first factor with 13 items (39% of the FLCAS). The fear in interaction with others for Group B is intense. It deals with a wide range of class activities related to interaction and is involved in interaction with teacher, students or both teacher and students. Group C has two factors (Factors 2 and 3) regarding the fear in interaction with others. Factor 2 has 7 items and focuses on interactions with teacher, while Factor 3 has 5 items and specifically concerns interactions with students. If the items for Factor 2 and Factor 3 are added together for Group C, it still has one item less than Factor 1 for Group B. Very interestingly, Group A seems to have no special fear in interaction with others. All the items about the fear in interaction with others from the FLCAS in Group A are dispersed into other factors.

Regarding the fear in interaction with others in Chinese class, the similarity between Group B and Group C and the difference between Group A and both Groups B and C likely manifest that the ethnic language and culture backgrounds might play an important role in foreign language anxiety.

3. Self-consciousness in Learning Chinese

Both Group A and Group B have Self-consciousness in Learning Chinese as a factor. It is Factor 2 (Self-consciousness in Speaking Chinese) for Group A and Factor 2 (Self-consciousness in Learning Chinese) and Factor 4 (Self-consciousness in Speaking Chinese) for Group B. The contents of the self-consciousness factor for Group A are narrower than that of Group B. However, this factor is stronger and more concentrated on speaking Chinese. Although Group B also includes self-consciousness in speaking Chinese in a factor, it only has 3 items and is ranked as Factor 4. It is worth noting that Group C does not include Self-consciousness in Learning Chinese as a factor. The concentrated self-consciousness in speaking Chinese for Group A is likely related to their learning

situation and goals for learning Chinese. Because the students from Group A, Group B and Group C study Chinese in the same class, the students from Group A are at somewhat of a disadvantage. The completely different ethnic language and culture make Group A's Chinese learning, especially Chinese writing, more difficult and time consuming in comparison with the other two groups. This situation might force them to focus more on spoken Chinese. Therefore, it is not difficult to understand why Group A's self-consciousness focuses on speaking Chinese. For Group B, it is natural for them to choose both spoken and written Chinese as their goal, since written Chinese is not so difficult and possibly even easier than spoken Chinese for them. Thus, the contents of their self-consciousness become wider than that of Group A. It is worth noting that Group C has no such self-consciousness included in any factors. It might be that their ethnic backgrounds make them have no such self-consciousness.

4. Worry about Lagging Behind

All three groups had Worry about Lagging Behind as a factor with 4 items, but the order and the contents of worry about lagging behind display some differences. It is ranked as Factor 3 for Group B and Factor 4 for both Group A and Group C. The worry for Group B concerns lagging behind in Chinese class and is wider than that for Group A and Group C. The worry about lagging behind in Group A specifically focuses on other students in Chinese class, and for Group C the worry concentrates on lagging behind the teaching process of Chinese. It seems that for Group A needs to work harder to catch up to the students from the other two groups. Because of the same ethnic language and cultural backgrounds, Group C has an advantage in learning Chinese than the other two groups, especially Group A. Thus, their worry about lagging behind does not concern the other students in the class but the teaching practices.

5. Ease in Chinese Class

All three groups include Ease in Chinese Class as a factor. It is Factor 3 for Group A, Factor 4 for Group C and Factor 5 for Group B. Group C has more items (5) than Group A (4) and Group B (3). It is worth noting that Ease in Chinese Class as a factor for Group A is ranked higher than in the other two groups, although they face more tougher learning task and alien learning environment. Their Western cultural backgrounds and experiences including their other foreign language learning experience might make them relatively more relaxed in learning Chinese.

6. Frustrated Feeling in Chinese Class

Only Group A and Group B have the factor Frustrated Feeling in Chinese Class. It is ranked as Factor 6 with 3 items for both groups. However, the contents of the factors show some differences. For Group A, the factor concerns teacher's correction as well as speaking in class, and for Group B the factor concerns tests and comparison with other classes.

Group C also had a Factor 6 but it seems to be completely different. Factor 6 for Group C is Confidence in Interaction with Native Speakers. No similar factor can be found in the other two groups. It is worth noting that Group C has half of all the factors concentrating on interaction with others. Besides this positive factor, there are two negative factors for Group C, which concerns Fear in Interaction with Teachers of Chinese and Fear in Interaction with Other Student in Chinese Class. Their ethnic language and culture likely give them more concern in interaction with local people, since they have a relatively higher level of Chinese and do not have to worry about "losing face" in the real world, as compared with speaking in the class.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the characteristics of American college students learning Chinese in China divided by ethnic background groups (Non-Asian, Non-Chinese Asian and Chinese backgrounds), with particular focus on their reasons for learning Chinese and studying Chinese in China, their beliefs about foreign language learning and their foreign language classroom anxiety. This chapter presents a summary of the findings, followed by conclusions, implications and limitations of this study, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of Findings

1. What are the characteristics of American college students learning Chinese in China?

The ethnic backgrounds of the participants were primarily Caucasian, Non-Chinese Asian, and Chinese. Eighty-one percent of the participants were native speakers of English. There were more female students than male students, especially within the Non-Chinese Asians. An overwhelming majority of the participants were Sophomores, Juniors and Seniors, aged 18 to 23. The average and range of ages in Group A (Non-Asian) were higher than Group B (Non-Chinese Asian) and Group C (Chinese background). Most of the participants were majoring in Humanities and Economics/Business. Groups A and B had more students majoring in Humanities, especially East Asian Studies and Chinese than Group C, while Group C had more students majoring in Science than both Group A and Group B. Group B and C had more students majoring in Economics/Business than Group A.

There was a wide range of ages when the students started to learn Chinese (1 to 37). An overwhelming majority of the participants started to learn Chinese in the U.S. between the ages of 18 and 22. However, more than one third of the Chinese background students started to learn Chinese in China or Taiwan. Most students had studied Chinese for two years or less. More students in Group A and B had studied Chinese for one or two years than those in Group C, while Group C had a much higher rate of studying Chinese for more than five years. An overwhelming majority of the students had been in China for less than one year. Most of the students spent 5 to 15 hours studying Chinese outside class per week. However, the students in Group A spent much more time studying Chinese outside of class than those in Group B and Group C. Most of the students in Group A spent 11 to 20 hours weekly, while most of the students in Group B and Group C spent fewer than 10 hours weekly. Over one of fourth of students in Group C spent even fewer than 5 hours weekly.

An overwhelming majority of the participants had previously studied at least one additional foreign language for three years or more. More than one of third of them had studied two and more additional foreign languages. The most popular other foreign languages were Spanish and French. The age of starting to learn other foreign languages was much earlier than the age of starting to learn Chinese. Most of the students started learning the other foreign language between ages 11 and 15. They had spent more years learning other foreign languages than they had spent learning Chinese. Most of the students had spent more than five years learning other foreign languages. Group A had a much higher rate of learning other foreign languages for more than five years than Group B or Group C. An overwhelming majority of the participants had traveled to other countries before arriving in China. The students in Group C had traveled less than those in Group A and Group B. Group A and Group C had traveled mostly in European countries, while Group B traveled mostly in East Asian countries.

Most of the participants' goals for learning Chinese were to become fluent in listening, speaking, reading and writing Chinese. However, nearly one-third of the students in Group A only wanted to become fluent in listening and speaking. An overwhelming majority of the participants enjoyed language learning and thought that they were good language learners. Group B had a higher rate of both enjoying language learning and perceiving themselves as good language learners than Group A and C. Most of the students rated their overall proficiency in Chinese in class as excellent or good while rating their overall proficiency as poor as compared with natives.

2. What kinds of reasons do American College students have for learning Chinese and for studying Chinese in China?

"Interest in culture", "Interest in language", "Need for future career", "Family influence" and "Need for travel" were the five most commonly cited reasons for studying Chinese. An overwhelming majority of the participants' motivations towards learning Chinese were "Interest in culture" and "Interest in language". The order of importance and the five most common factors for Groups A and B are similar, but different for Group C. An overwhelming majority of the students in Group C studied Chinese because of "Family influence", while the students in Group A and Group B reported studying Chinese primarily for "Interest in the language". More students in Group A studied Chinese because of an "Interest in culture" than in Groups B and C. Other important differences among the three groups including the following students in Groups A and B are more concerned about learning Chinese for their future careers than those in Group C; more students studied Chinese because they were "Required to take an elective to graduate" in Group B than in Groups A and C; and more students studied Chinese due to "Friend and relative influence in Groups A and B than in Group C".

An overwhelming majority of the participants went to China to study Chinese because they viewed it to be "More effective", "More interesting" and

more "authentic". These three factors were also number 1 reason for Groups A, B and C to study in China.

3. What are the language learning beliefs of American college students learning Chinese in China? How do there beliefs compare with the beliefs of other learning groups?

An overwhelming majority of the participants believed that some languages were easier to learn than others. This finding is similar to several previous studies about American students learning German, French, Spanish and Japanese (Horwitz, 1988; Kern, 1995; and Oh, 1996). However**,** the rate of endorsement is much lower than several EFL studies in Taiwan, Turkish-Cyprus, and Korea (Yang, 1992; Kunt, 1997; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995 and Kim-Yoon, 2000). An overwhelming majority of the participants believed Chinese was a "very difficult" or "difficult language". Group C has a higher rate of thinking that Chinese is a "very difficult" or "difficult language" than Groups A and B, even though they have relatively higher levels of Chinese. The reason might be Group C's much more difficult goal for mastering reading and writing Chinese. Although most of the students thought that Chinese was difficult, a majority of each group still believed that they would ultimately learn to speak it very well. Group B shows more confidence in this belief than Groups A and C. Contrary to the optimism about language learning showed by previous studies (Horwitz, 1999), the subjects' answers on the time requirements for the language learning in this study seem more practical, even a little pessimistic.

An overwhelming majority of the participants believed that children were better foreign language learners than adults and that some people have a special ability for learning foreign languages. Most of the students believed that the previous foreign language learning experience could help them to learn another one. However, the endorsement for this belief in this study is much lower than that in Horwitz's study (1988) of American students leaning Spanish, French and German. Group C shows a much higher level of disagreement with the belief

"People who are good at mathematics or science are not good at learning foreign languages" than Groups A and B.

Most of the students in this study believed that it was necessary to know about the culture of a target language in order to learn to speak it well. The agreement rate is higher than that of American students learning German, French and Spanish in Horwitz's study (1988). Compared with students with similar ethnic backgrounds (Non-Asian) in Horwitz's study, the endorsement for this belief in Group A is nearly double that found in Horwitz's study. Group A also has a much stronger belief about the importance of studying the target language in the target country than those in Horwitz's study.

Regarding beliefs about the most important part of learning a foreign language, an overwhelming majority of the participants were either neutral or endorsed learning vocabulary and learning grammar. This finding is close to the finding in Oh's study (1996) of American students learning Japanese, but contrary to the high disagreement found in Horwitz's (1988) and Kern's (1995) studies. Chinese and Japanese are less commonly taught foreign languages, and their vocabulary and grammar are quite different from Western foreign languages. This fact might enable Chinese and Japanese learners to pay more attention to learning vocabulary and grammar than those who learn relatively similar Western foreign languages. The percentage of the students who valued an excellent pronunciation was much higher than that of American students learning German, French and Spanish (Horwitz, 1988), but almost equal to that of American students learning Japanese (Oh, 1996) and that of EFL students in East Asia (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995 and Truitt, 1995). Group C emphasized this belief more strongly than Groups A and B. Their experience in Chinese-dialect-speaking families likely makes them more aware of the importance of correct pronunciation from the beginning.

An overwhelming majority of the participants (more than the percentage of students of commonly taught languages) enjoyed practicing Chinese with Chinese people. This may be an important reason why they go to China to study Chinese. The endorsement rate for this belief in Group A was higher than in Groups B and C. Contrary to the high endorsement of the students in Horwitz's study, for the item "I feel timid speaking Chinese (my foreign language) with other people," Group A shows a high rate of disagreement. The contrasting views between Group A and groups with similar ethnic backgrounds in Horwitz's study might be explained by Group A's early age starting to learn foreign language, multiple foreign language learning experiences, strong motivations and clear goals for learning Chinese. A majority of the participants were neutral or disagreed with the belief that "If beginning students are permitted to make errors in Chinese, it will be difficult for them to speak correctly later on," which is different from the high rate of agreement in American students learning German, French and Spanish (Horwitz, 1988). The different views in this study may result from the Chinese tone system, since it is easy to make mistakes and requires much more time to learn correct pronunciation.

Contrary to the pessimistic job expectations of the American students learning commonly taught foreign language (Horwitz, 1988 and Kern, 1995), the participants in this study have optimistic job expectations because of their Chinese language ability, even though they have a relatively pessimistic view of other people's opinions about speaking Chinese. However, the job expectations in this study are slightly lower than those of EFL students (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kunt, 1997 and Kim-Yoon, 2000), but slightly higher than those of American students learning Japanese (Oh, 1996). An overwhelming majority of the participants wanted to learn Chinese culture, speak Chinese well and have Chinese friends. The integrative motivation for the students in this study seems to be much stronger than that found in American students learning commonly taught foreign languages and EFL learners.

4. What are the views and evaluations about learning Chinese in China among the American students learning Chinese in China?

An overwhelming majority of the participants believed that they needed to study Chinese abroad if they wanted to learn Chinese well. They highly valued the opportunity to study Chinese in China. The students in Group A show a much stronger belief about the importance of studying Chinese in China than those in Groups B and C. Most of the participants believed that learning Chinese within Chinese society was more important than in a Chinese language class in China. Thus, probably the target-language society, not the target-language classes, attracted the students to study Chinese in China.

Comparing the effectiveness of Chinese language teaching methods used in China and in the U.S., most of the students had a neutral view. However, more students favored the methods used in China than in the U.S. Among the three groups, Groups A and B were more favorable toward the teaching methods used in China, while Group C were more favorable toward the teaching methods used in the U.S. The high rates of neutrality and mixed views about the teaching methods used in China and in the U.S. might result from students' personal learning experiences in local Chinese classes, where the Chinese programs and teaching methods are varied and typically designed for Chinese-background students. Comparing the instruction of Chinese language class in China and that in the U.S., most of the students were either neutral or favored the instruction in Chinese classes in China. Group B has a much higher level of endorsement than Groups A and C.

Most of the participants thought that their Chinese language programs in China were excellent overall. However, in comparison to Chinese language teachers in the U.S., an overwhelming majority of the participants had a neutral evaluation of the teachers in China. Once again, more participants in Group B than in Groups A and C favored the Chinese language teachers in China. In contrast, Group A had a much higher endorsement rate for the Chinese language

teachers in the U.S. The main reason for Group A to favor the Chinese language teachers in the U.S. might be due to the teachers' English proficiency, awareness of American culture, and flexible and interesting instructional methods. The higher evaluation of the language programs and teachers in China for Group B is likely related to the fact that the Chinese language programs, textbooks and teaching methods in China were originally designed for students from Japan, Korea and Southeast Asia countries, and therefore, the students in Group B likely benefit more from their study in China than other types of students.

5. What factors contribute to the language learning beliefs of the American students learning Chinese in China? Are these factors different from other learning groups?

The factor analysis of the BALLI in this study identified five factors: (1) Motivation and Aptitude in Learning Foreign Languages; (2) The Nature and Characteristics of Learning Chinese; (3) Self-Efficacy and Strategies used in Learning Spoken Chinese; (4) Perspectives on Foreign Language Learners; (5) The Difficulty of Chinese and Strategies for Learning Chinese. The comparison of the five factors in the present study with the factors found in several other studies using the BALLI, including five studies of EFL learners (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995, Kunt, 1997 and Kim-Yoon, 2000) and one study of Japanese learners in the U.S. (Oh, 1996), shows some important structure and content differences. There are more factors in this study than in other studies (except for Truitt's study that also had five factors). Compared with the lower rank or lack of motivational factors in most previous studies, the special combination of motivation with aptitude, large number of items and highly loaded data for the first factor in this study show that the participants in this study are more motivated and aptitude-oriented than other learners. Motivation as a component of the first factor in both this study and Oh's (1996) study of learners of Japanese in the U.S. suggest that the importance of motivation might relate to the degree of difficulty in language learning. Learners of less commonly

taught foreign languages might pay more attention to the specific characteristics of the language they are learning.

The present study included both Self-Efficacy and Strategies Used in Foreign Language Learning and the Difficulty of Chinese and Strategies for Learning Chinese as factors. However, none of the six previous studies (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Oh, 1996; Kunt 1997 and Kim-Yoon, 2000) showed these contents as factor. This finding might suggest that the participants in this study pay more attention to the difficulty of language learning and emphasize strategies for language learning more than the participants in the other studies. It might indicate that the American students studying Chinese in China are not only more motivated but also more strategy-oriented than the students in the other studies.

6. What level of foreign language anxiety do the American students learning Chinese in China have? Are there different levels of foreign language anxiety among the three subgroups?

The participants in this study reported the highest levels of foreign language anxiety among the other studies using the FLCAS, including Horwitz's (1986) study of American students learning Spanish, Aida's (1994) and Oh's (1996) studies of American students learning Japanese and three studies of EFL students in Korea (Truitt, 1997), in China (Yan, 1998) and in Turkish-Cyprus (Kunt, 1997). Although the anxiety levels found in the two studies on EFL students in East Asian countries are lower than those found in the present study, they are still much higher than those found in the other studies, especially EFL students in Turkish-Cyprus. Learning a less commonly taught foreign language abroad is likely a main reason for the high anxiety level in this study. It is also possible that higher levels of anxiety found in this study and the two EFL studies in East Asian countries are related to the ethnic languages and cultures of the students as well as the ethnic languages and cultures of the countries where they study.

The present study finds the same high level of foreign language anxiety among the three ethnic groups. However, the reasons for the high level of anxiety among them are likely different. The completely different ethnic language and culture in China likely make students in Group A more anxious than those in the other groups. In addition, the characteristics of East Asian cultures, such as shyness, inwardness (Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000), other-orientation, and child-rearing practice (Chang, 1997), likely make the students in Group B and C more anxious than those in Group A, even though their similar ethnic languages and cultures would seem to predict lower levels of anxiety than those found in Group A. Therefore, the influence of ethnic backgrounds and the special situation of learning Chinese in China contributed to the three ethnic groups' similar (high) levels of anxiety in different ways.

The participants in this study showed their anxiety levels increased as their age increased. Female students showed a significantly higher level of anxiety than male students. Regarding majors, the students with an undecided major had the lowest levels of anxiety, while the students majoring in Education had the highest levels of anxiety. The students majoring in Economics/Business, East Asian studies and Chinese had relatively lower levels of anxiety than those majoring in Science, Social Science, Humanities, and Medical Science.

The results of the FLCAS showed that the anxiety levels of the participants increased as the age of starting to learn Chinese increased. That is, the earlier one started to learn Chinese, the less anxiety they had. In contrast, the anxiety levels of the students learning other foreign languages decreased as the age of starting to learn other foreign languages increased. The students who spent the least time (less than 5 hours) studying Chinese outside the class weekly as well as those who spent the most time (more than 20 hours) had a lower level of anxiety than those in the middle groups. The students who had studied one other foreign language had higher levels of anxiety than those who had not studied any other foreign languages or who had studied two or more other foreign languages.

The students who had studied German and Japanese had a lower level of anxiety than those who had studied French and Spanish. Students whose goal for learning Chinese was to become fluent in listening, speaking, reading and writing showed a lower level of anxiety than those students who just wanted to become fluent in listening and speaking. The former subgroup was probably more confident in their Chinese learning and had a relative higher level of Chinese and therefore they choose a more difficult goal. The present study also shows that the students who enjoyed learning Chinese have a lower level of anxiety than students who do not.

7. What factors contribute to the anxiety of American students learning Chinese in China among the three ethnic groups?

Although all previous studies using the FLCAS did not include a factor analysis, in order to further explore the FLCAS, the present study did a factor analysis of each group. The total mean scores of the FLCAS for Group A, Group B and Group C indicated that the three ethnic groups had almost the same level of foreign language anxiety. However, the factor analyses found that the contents and orders of the factors among the three ethnic groups had some important differences. The factor analyses found that each group had six factors. The factors for Group A were Nervous and Tense Feeling in Chinese Class, Self-consciousness in Speaking Chinese, Ease in Chinese Class, Pressure from Chinese Class, Worry about Lagging Behind Other Students and Frustrated Feeling in Chinese Class, while for Group B were Fear in Interaction with Chinese Teachers and Other Students, Self-consciousness in Learning Chinese, Worry about Lagging Behind in Chinese Class, Self-consciousness in speaking Chinese, Ease in Chinese Class, and Frustrated Feeling in Chinese Class. The factors for Group C were Nervousness in speaking Chinese in Chinese Class, Fear in Interaction with Chinese Teachers, Fear in Interaction with Other Students in Chinese Class, Ease in Chinese Class, Worry about Lagging Behind Teaching Progress of Chinese, and Confidence in Interaction with the Native Speakers.

Nervousness in Chinese class plays a key role as the first factor for both Group A and Group C. However, the nervousness in Group A is more intense, wide and complicated than that in Group C. It seems to be mixed with other negative feelings, such as tension, fear and embarrassment and is also connected to various class activities, while in Group C, the nervousness seems to exclusively focus on speaking Chinese in Chinese class. The reason for Group A to have this kind of nervousness is likely that they are not only learning a less commonly taught foreign language in a target country but also facing a radically different learning environment and culture. The shyness, inwardness and other-orientation of their ethnic culture likely make Group C nervous in speaking Chinese.

Both Group B and Group C have fear in interaction with others as factors. However, the fear in interaction with others in Group B is more conspicuous, intense, wide, and mixed. In contrast to Groups B and C, Group A seems to show no special fear in interaction with others. The differences between Group A and Groups B and C suggest that ethnic backgrounds, especially cultures, play an important role in foreign language learning, particularly with the respect to anxiety. As I explained before, compared with Western culture, East Asian cultures have traits of shyness, inwardness and other-orientation. Their ethnic cultures likely make Groups B and C particularly feel fearful in interaction with others in Chinese class. The American culture and education system likely make Group A have no such fear in interaction with others, although they face a more alien living and learning environment in China than Groups B and C.

Both Group A and Group B but not Group C have Self-consciousness in Learning Chinese as a factor. The different ethnic languages and cultures likely make Group A's Chinese learning, especially Chinese writing, more difficult and time consuming than for the other two groups. This situation likely forces many of the participants in Group A to focus more on spoken Chinese and therefore, their self-consciousness focuses on speaking Chinese. For Group B, writing

Chinese is somewhat easier than speaking Chinese and thus, their self-consciousness involves both speaking and writing Chinese.

All three groups include Worry about Lagging Behind as a factor but the contents of the Worry about Lagging Behind factors have some important differences. Group B worries about lagging behind in Chinese class, which is a little wider than that in Groups A and C. The worry in Group A specifically focuses on lagging behind other students, while in Group C, the worry concentrates on lagging behind the teaching practices.

All three groups have Ease in Chinese Class as a factor, but the rank of the factor in Group A is higher than that in Groups B and C. It seems that American culture and learning experiences make Group A relatively more relaxed in learning Chinese, though they face tougher learning tasks and a more alien learning environment in comparison with Groups B and C.

Both Group A and Group B have a factor of Frustrated Feeling in Chinese Class. However, the content of the factor shows some differences. For Group A, it concerns teachers' corrections and students' own speaking in the class, and for Group B, it is about tests and comparisons with other classes. Only Group C includes a factor of Confidence in Interaction with Native Speakers. Group C also has more factors concentrating on interaction with others. It seems that Group C's Chinese language and cultural backgrounds and the advantage of their learning environment make them pay more attention to interaction with others and more confident in their interactions with local people.

Conclusions

1. The present study has identified some unique and important characteristics of American college students studying Chinese in China and provided an overall profile of them. This study has identified three main ethnic backgrounds of American college students learning Chinese in China: Non-Asian

background, Non-Chinese Asian background and Chinese background. This study shows that different ethnic language and culture backgrounds play an important role in Chinese learning in China. Significant demographic differences among the three ethnic groups are found in the areas of age, gender, majors, age of starting to learn Chinese, the hours spent on studying Chinese outside class, age of starting to learn other languages, other languages studied and self-perspectives on Chinese proficiency compared with the natives.

Among the American students studying Chinese in China, this study has found that most of the students were Sophomores, Juniors and Seniors aged 18 to 23, majored in Humanities and Economics/Business, started to learn a foreign language between 11 to 15, studied at least one additional foreign language for three years or more and traveled to other countries. Most of the students started to learn Chinese between 18 and 22, studied Chinese for two years or less, studied Chinese in China for less than one year and spent 5 to 15 hours studying Chinese outside of class weekly. Most of the students had a Chinese learning goal for becoming fluent in listening, speaking, reading and writing, enjoyed language learning, thought themselves as good language learners, rated their overall proficiency in Chinese language in the class as excellent and good, and rated their overall proficiency in Chinese language as poor compared with natives.

2. This study has found some important differences among the three ethnic groups in their motivation towards learning Chinese, beliefs about language learning and learning Chinese in China and foreign language anxiety. The different ethnic language and culture backgrounds likely play an important role for these differences.

For motivations towards learning Chinese, an overwhelming majority of the students in Group C were motivated by "Family influence", a much higher rate of "Interest in language" found in Groups A and B than in Group C, and a much stronger "Interest in culture" in Group A than in Groups B and C are the three largest differences among the three groups. There are some other important

differences: Groups A and B are more concerned about learning Chinese for their future career than Group C; Group B has a much higher rate of studying Chinese as a required elective than Groups A and C; and Groups A and B have more students who study Chinese because of "Friend and relative influence" than Group C.

The most important factors for Group A, Group B and Group C to study Chinese in China are "More effective", "More interesting" and an "Authentic learning environment" respectively. More students regard studying Chinese in China as their "important experience for future career" in Group A than in Groups B and C, while more students go to China to study by "Friend influence" in Groups B and C than in Group A.

For beliefs about language learning, the three ethnic groups have showed some important differences. Much more students believe that Chinese is a difficult language in Group C than in Groups A and B. The reason might be Group C's much higher goal for reading and writing Chinese. The students in Group B show more confidence in the belief that they can ultimately learn to speak the target language very well than those in Groups A and C, while the students in Group C show a much higher disagreement with the belief that "People who are good at mathematics or science are not good at learning foreign languages" than those in Groups B and C. The students in Group A has a much stronger belief about necessity and importance of learning Chinese culture, studying Chinese in China and practicing Chinese with Chinese people than those in Groups B and C.

The three ethnic groups also have important differences for beliefs about learning Chinese in China. Comparing Chinese language teachers in China with those in the U.S., Group B favors the Chinese language teachers in China, while Group A favors the Chinese language teachers in the U.S. Group B also has a higher evaluation of the Chinese programs in China than Groups A and C. The main reasons for Group A to favor Chinese language teachers in the U.S. might

be their better English proficiency, greater awareness of American culture and more flexible and interesting instructional methods. The higher evaluation of Chinese language programs and Chinese language teachers in China in Group B is not surprising since most of the Chinese language programs in China, textbooks and teaching methods were originally designed for students from their same ethnic background.

The present study found that participants have a high level of foreign language anxiety but the degree of anxiety does not differ among the three ethnic groups. However, the reasons for the high level of the anxiety for the three ethic groups may be different. The different ethnic language and culture in China likely make Group A more anxious than the other two groups, even though American culture and their previous foreign language learning experience in the U.S. should make them less anxious. The characteristics of East Asian culture, such as shyness, inwardness (Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000), other-oriented consideration and more restrictive child-rearing practices (Chang, 1997), likely contribute to anxiety in Groups B and C, even though their similar ethnic languages and cultures should reduce their anxiousness in learning Chinese in China. The influence of ethnic backgrounds and the special situation of learning Chinese in China likely cause the three ethnic groups almost the same high level of the anxiety, but the reasons for the anxiety are different for the three groups.

The present study was the first to conduct a factor analysis of the FLCAS. The three factor analyses for the three different ethnic groups statistically explored and compared the sources of foreign language anxiety. Each group showed six factors but the factors in the three groups show some import differences in the contents, sources and order. Both group A and Group B have "nervousness" in Chinese Class as factor 1, but nervousness in Group A is more intense, wide and complicated than that in Group C. It seems to be mixed with some other negative feelings and connected to various class activities, while in Group C, nervousness seems to exclusively focus on speaking Chinese in Chinese

class. The reason for Group A to have such nervousness is likely that they are not only learning a less commonly taught foreign language in the target country but also facing a different and sometime even opposite learning environment and culture. The shyness, inwardness and other-oriented consideration from their ethnic culture likely make Group C nervous in speaking Chinese in Chinese class.

The differences related to ethnic language and cultural backgrounds and the situation of learning Chinese in China can be also found among other factors in the three groups. Both Group B and Group C have a fear in interaction with others as a factor, but in contrast, Group A shows no special fear in interaction with others as a factor. As I explained before, compared with Western culture, East Asian culture has the traits of the shyness, inwardness and other-oriented consideration. Their ethnic cultures likely make Groups B and C particularly feel fearful in interaction with others in Chinese class. Both Group A and Group B have the Self-consciousness in Learning Chinese as a factor, but their focuses show the difference. The difficulty and time consuming of learning Chinese writing makes Group A's self-consciousness focusing on spoken Chinese, while the relative easiness in writing Chinese than in speaking Chinese makes Group B's self-consciousness involves both speaking and writing Chinese.

The present study shows that all three groups have Worry about Lagging Behind as a factor but the contents of Worry about Lagging Behind show some differences. Group B is concerning lagging behind Chinese class, which is a little wider than that in Group A and Group C. The worry in Group A specifically focuses on lagging behind other students, while in Group C, the worry concentrates on lagging behind the teaching practices. These differences are also likely related to their different ethnic backgrounds and learning situations. The similar causes can also be found among other factor differences. For example, all three groups have Ease in Chinese class as a factor, but the rank of the factor is higher than Groups B and C. It is likely that American culture and their multiple language learning experiences make them relatively more relaxed in Chinese class,

though they face tougher learning tasks and alien learning environment in comparison with Groups B and C. Among the three groups, only Group C has a factor of Confidence in Interaction with Native Speakers and it also has more factors concentrating on interaction with others. It seems that Group C's Chinese language and culture backgrounds, a relatively high level of spoken Chinese and the advantage of their learning environment make them pay more attention to interaction with others and confident in interaction with local people.

3. For beliefs about language learning, this study has found some important differences between American students learning Chinese in China and American students learning foreign languages in U.S. and EFL students in their own countries. Contrary to the overly-optimistic beliefs about the time requirements for language learning found in several other studies (Horwitz, 1999), the participants in this study were more realistic. The characteristics of the Chinese language and the traditional Chinese curriculum, likely make the participants have a stronger belief about the importance of learning vocabulary and grammar and speaking the target language with excellent pronunciation than the American students learning German, French and Spanish (Horwitz, 1988). However, this belief in the present study is similar to that in Oh's (1996) study of Japanese learners. Fewer students in this study believe that previous foreign language learning experience helps in learning a new one than those in Horwitz's (1988) study. The participants' instrumental belief about jobs is higher than found in American students studying German, French and Spanish and Japanese (Horwitz, 1988; Kern, 1995 and Oh, 1996), but lower than EFL students (Yang, 1992; Park, 1995; Truitt, 1995; Kunt, 1997 and Kim-Yoon, 2000). Importantly, their integrative motivational beliefs about learning culture and having target language friends are much stronger than that of the students in all previous studies.

Another important finding in this study is that the participants are divided into three ethnic groups and their beliefs show many important differences

because of their different ethnic backgrounds. (Please see the previous discussion comparing the beliefs about language learning and learning Chinese in China and the factors contributing to foreign language anxiety among the three ethnic groups).

4. American students learning Chinese in China are highly motivated foreign language learners. They have both strong instrumental and integrative motivations to learn Chinese, especially the latter. The five most common factors that motivated the participants to learn Chinese were: "Interested in culture", "Interested in language", "Need it for own future career goal", "Influenced by family" and "Need it for travel". They especially believe that studying in China is more effective, more interesting and more authentic. Contrary to the pessimistic job expectations of American students studying commonly taught foreign languages in the U.S., the participants in this study have optimistic job expectations. Compared with American students learning commonly taught foreign languages and EFL students, they have a much stronger desire to learn the target culture, speak the target language well, practice the target language with natives and to have target language friends.

5. American students learning Chinese in China are confident but highly anxious foreign language learners. A substantial majority of them had a long history of foreign language learning, enjoyed learning languages, perceived themselves as good language learners, rated their overall proficiency in Chinese language as excellent and believed that they would ultimately learn to speak Chinese very well. However, they also have the highest levels of foreign language anxiety found in studies using the FLCAS, including both commonly and less commonly taught foreign languages learners in the U.S. (Horwitz, 1986; Oh, 1996 and Aida, 1994) and EFL learners in their own countries (Truitt, 1997; Yan, 1998 and Kunt, 1997). The main reason for the high level of anxiety is likely the situation of learning a less commonly taught foreign language abroad and the influence of East Asian culture and traditional Chinese language teaching

methods. Among the participants in this study, the level of anxiety consistently increases as the age of the groups or the age of starting to learn Chinese increases. In contrast, anxiety levels consistently decrease as the age of starting to learn other foreign languages increases. Female students have a higher level of the anxiety than male students in this study. The students whose goal of learning Chinese was to become fluent in listening, speaking, reading and writing have lower levels of anxiety than those who just wanted to become fluent in listening and speaking. The students who enjoyed learning Chinese have lower levels of anxiety than those who did not.

6. The present study supports Gardner et al.'s Socio-Educational model of Second Language Acquisition about the important role of the socio-cultural milieu in second language learning (Gardner et al., 1983; Gardner, 1985 and Gardner et al., 1999). Gardner et al. pointed out, "The socio-cultural milieu plays an important role in that it can influence individuals of attitudes, motivation, and anxiety as well as the relative importance that these attributes play in the language learning process". "Individuals' early experiences in a specific socio-cultural context could be expected to play a role in the development of their attitudes and motivation associated with second language learning. More over, their experiences in the home, which may or may not be the same as their experiences in the social environment, could similarly influence their attitudes and motivation" (Garner et al. 1999, p.422). In the present study, because of the influence of their ethnic languages and cultures in the home, both Group B and Group C, especially Group C, have different motivational characteristics towards learning Chinese and studying Chinese in China, different beliefs about Chinese learning, and different sources of foreign language anxiety, though the three ethnic groups live in the same socio-cultural context of the U.S. and study in the same learning environment in China. The early experiences of the participants in their, homes and communities, play an important role in the development of their motivations, beliefs, and anxiety associated with Chinese learning.

7. The present study supports the argument of Horwitz (2000, 2001) and MacIntyre (1995a, 1995b) for the existence of language anxiety independent of first or general language learning disabilities. In a series of studies, Sparks and Ganshow and their colleges (Parks & Ganshow, 1991; 1993a; 1993b; Parks & Ganshow, et al 1995; 1997; 1998 and 2000) questioned the general construct of foreign language anxiety. They put forward the Linguistic Coding Differences Hypothesis (LCDH) that "FL learning is based primarily on one's native language learning ability (i.e., language aptitude), students' anxiety about FL learning is likely to be a consequence of their FL learning difficulties, and students' language learning ability is a confounding variable when studying the impact of effective differences (e.g., anxiety, motivation, attitude) on FL learning" (Sparks et al 2000, p.251). Horwitz and MacIntyre argued that the Linguistic Coding Differences Hypothesis could not explain all anxiety reactions and made a significant omission by assigning mere epiphenomenal status to affective variables in general and language anxiety in particular.

The present study shows supports the existence of language anxiety independent of first or general language learning disabilities. Group B and Group C, especially Group C, have great advantages in learning Chinese in China since their ethnic language and culture backgrounds are similar to and even the same as the target language, target culture and learning environment. According to the Linguistic Coding Differences Hypothesis, Groups B and C should have less difficulty learning Chinese in China and therefore should have less anxiety than English-speaking Chinese learners. However, the current study shows high levels of anxiety in Group B and Group C, the same or even a little higher than those found in Group A. The characteristics of East Asian culture, such as shyness, inwardness (Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000), other oriented consideration, and controlling child-rearing practice (Chang, 1997), likely make Groups B and C have almost same high levels of anxiety as Group A. As argued throughout this dissertation, the characteristics of East Asian cultures and American culture

contribute the different anxiety levels found in this study. The findings of this study show that ethnic languages and culture backgrounds, learning environments, and personal learning experiences can increase or decrease levels of foreign language anxiety.

Implications

The present study might be the first to provide a view of the reasons for study, language beliefs and foreign language anxiety of American students studying Chinese in China as well as that of American students learning a less commonly taught foreign language in the target language country. This study is also the first to explore motivation, language learning beliefs and foreign language anxiety of American students learning a less commonly taught foreign language by focusing on their ethnic language and culture backgrounds. The findings of the present study provide new insights on the backgrounds, motivations, language learning beliefs and foreign language anxiety of students studying a less commonly taught foreign language in a target language country.

Because of the general difficulty and usefulness of less commonly taught foreign languages, students of less commonly taught foreign languages are an especially interesting learner group. As this study indicates, the backgrounds, especially ethnic language and cultural backgrounds, play an important role in learning a less commonly taught foreign language. The influence of ethnic language and cultural backgrounds, is likely to be found in the motivation, language learning beliefs and foreign language anxiety of students learning a less commonly taught foreign language. Therefore, it is important to pay special attention to learners' backgrounds, especially their ethnic language and cultural backgrounds, when exploring the learning phenomena associated with learning less commonly taught foreign languages.

Generally speaking, the difference between the socio-cultural contexts of learning environments in a country of a less commonly taught foreign language and that of the U.S. is more complicated than that between the U.S. and a country of a commonly taught foreign language. It is therefore essential to explore the role of learners' ethnic language and cultural backgrounds to understand how students approach less commonly taught languages.

Few studies have addressed the affective characteristics of American students learning Chinese. Previous studies either considered Chinese learners as a single group, such as Samimy & Lee's (1997) study of language beliefs of first-year Chinese learners and their instructors at the Ohio State University, or excluded Non-Asian background students, such as Wen's (1997) study of motivational factors of American students learning Chinese at the University of Houston. The present study explores the affective characteristics of American students studying Chinese within their ethnic language and cultural groups. As the findings of this study show, there are some striking differences among Non-Asian, Asian and Chinese background students, and therefore, in order to explain the affective characteristics of American students learning Chinese, it is necessary to explore the role of the ethnic language and cultural backgrounds among the different ethnic groups learning Chinese, especially because of the rapid increase of Non-Asian background students in recent years.

The findings of the role of ethnic language and culture backgrounds in learning a less commonly taught foreign language (Chinese) in the target language country (China) in this study provide a new theoretical explanation for some of the affective differences that have been found among foreign language learners. For example, based on the role of ethnic language and culture backgrounds found in this study, a better possible explanation, for the surprisingly lower level of anxiety of Japanese learners than French and Russian learners in Saito, Horwitz & and Garza's (1999) study of foreign language reading anxiety is possible. Saito, Horwitz & and Garza found that the anxiety levels of Japanese

learners were substantially lower than learners of French, or Russian, They also concluded that " the role of culture and other background knowledge in reading anxiety is somewhat perplexing" because students of Japanese indicated less anxiety than students of French and Russian on the survey items such as "Japanese (French, Russian) culture and ideas seem very foreign to me" (11% versus 50% and 52%) and "You have to know so much about Japanese (French, Russian) history and culture in order to read Japanese" (15% versus 71% and 69%). Their study also showed a much higher percentage of students of French and Russian endorsing the statement "I would be happy just learn to speak" (60% and 83% versus 16%) and "The hardest part of learning (French, Russian, Japanese) is learning to read" (74% and 88% versus 28%). Saito, Horwitz and Garzy hypathesize that "Students of Japanese might have been more motivated and psychologically prepared for the script and other reading difficulties than students studying the more commonly taught languages" (p.212-213).

A better possible explanation for "a surprisingly lower level of anxiety of Japanese learners on some items of anxiety" in Saito, Horwitz & and Garza's (1999) study might be the role of ethic language and culture backgrounds. There are likely a much larger percentage of students with ethnic backgrounds from East Asia and Southeast Asia among the learners of Japanese than among the learners of French and Russian. Most of these students are already familiar with some of Japanese language system and culture because of their own ethic language and culture backgrounds. Even for students without Asian backgrounds, compared with learners of French and Russian, learning to read Japanese is not so difficult, especially for beginners, even though Japanese is a less commonly taught foreign language. A large portion of written Japanese is Grairaigo (loanwords from other languages) and 90% of them came from English (Shinnouchi, 2000). Katakanas and Hiraganas are two forms of Japanese alphabetic-like phonetic and writing symbols. Grairaigo words are written in Katakanas, based on their original pronunciations. Native Japanese words are

written in Hiraganas, which can also be used to write for all Chinese characters (Kanji) (a very common situation in low level of Japanese). Therefore, the influence of ethic language and culture backgrounds added to the special characteristics of the language likely explain the substantially lower levels of anxiety found in the Japanese learners.

The role of ethnic language and culture backgrounds might also explain the different levels of foreign language anxiety found among EFL students. Kunt (1997) in her study of EFL students in Turkish-Cyprus concluded "Turkish-speaking university students have low foreign language anxiety compared to students in other studies which is sort of surprising" (p.134). Compared with the ethnic language and culture backgrounds and the learning environments of EFL students in East Asian countries (Truitt, 1995 and Yan, 1998), the ethnic language and culture backgrounds and the learning environments of Turkish EFL students in Turkish-Cyprus are much closer to the English language system and Western culture. The shyness, inwardness (Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000), other-oriented consideration and more restrictive and controlling child-rearing practice (Chang, 1997) of East Asian culture as well as the contrasting language systems likely make EFL students in East Asian countries much more anxious than the EFL students in Turkey.

The present study also found that the American students studying Chinese in China highly valued the opportunity of learning Chinese abroad, but they evaluated learning Chinese in Chinese society as more important and useful than learning Chinese in Chinese language class in China. They had very high levels of both instrumental and integrative motivations, especially the latter, though the sources of motivations for the three ethnic groups showed some differences. The curricula of Chinese programs, the textbooks and the instruction of teachers should consider and reflect these motivational desires and needs.

The findings of this study have indicated that American students studying Chinese in China have the highest level of foreign language anxiety among the all

studies using the FLCAS. This finding is logical and understandable, considering the situation of learning a less commonly taught foreign language in the target country. However, there is a need to reduce the level of students' anxiety, by improving the learning environment, the quality of teachers and instructional methods based on students' backgrounds, especially ethnic languages and cultures, goals for learning Chinese and previous Chinese language learning experiences.

The present study is the first to perform a factor analysis of the FLCAS. The three factor analyses for the three different ethnic groups explored and compared the content and anxiety sources among the three ethnic groups. Further factor analyses of the FLCAS should lead to a better understanding of foreign language anxiety and how it functions in language learning.

Although the Chinese programs involved in this studied are labeled as Chinese programs for American students, it is likely more suitable for the students in Group B than Groups A or C, with respect to the contents goals, and methods of instruction. The textbooks, activities and teaching methods came from Chinese programs originally designed for Japanese, Korean and Southeast Asian students. There is a need to establish different Chinese programs which pay special attention to the different needs of students based on their ethnic language and culture backgrounds, learning goals, Chinese learning experiences, and other factors.

The findings of this study show that the students in Group A favored the Chinese language teachers in the U.S. over those in China. In order to improve their Chinese teaching, especially to Non-Asian background students, the Chinese teachers in China need to familiarize themselves with English language and American culture, to learn about differences between the Chinese language and culture and English language and American culture. They also need to familiarize themselves with Western theories and methods of second language acquisition and apply them in their instruction.

The findings of the similarities and differences in reasons for learning the language and studying abroad, beliefs about language learning and foreign language anxiety among the heritage and non-heritage learner of Chinese in this study might be also useful for studies of heritage and non-heritage learners of commonly taught foreign languages, such as Spanish learners. The ethnic languages and cultures also play an important role in commonly taught foreign language learners, though the role might be not so obvious and the areas and functions of the role might be quite different. The fastest growing of heritage language populations in the U.S. is Spanish-speaking immigrants and Americans of Hispanic descent who come from Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Central and South American backgrounds. Both heritage and non-heritage Spanish learners have increased rapidly recently (Lewelling et al, 1999; IIE, 2004). Campbell (1996) indicated that the average heritage language student possesses a level of competence in many aspects of his or her ancestral language that far exceeds what typical students in foreign language courses can attain after many years of formal study. Lewelling and Peyton (1999) found some different characteristics of language skills and attitude towards bilingualism among the different generations of heritage Spanish learners. Valdes (1997) claimed that heritage students enrolled in Spanish courses for a number of reasons, including a desire to reactivate the Spanish they have learned in the past and develop it further, to learn more about their language and cultural heritage, to acquire literacy skills in Spanish, to enhance career opportunities, or to fulfill a foreign language requirement. Bills (1997) concluded that Spanish instruction that had been developed for monolingual English speakers was inappropriate for Spanish speakers. There is an increased number of studies of heritage learners of Spanish, but very few studies focusing on the role of ethnic languages and cultures among heritage and non-heritage Spanish learners. Exploring the similarities and differences of affective characteristics between heritage and non-heritage Spanish learners can help better understand them and satisfy their different needs.

Limitations

In interpreting the findings, one should keep in mind several limitations of this study. First, this study was based on a sample of 133 American college students learning Chinese in seven key universities in four large cities in China in the spring and summer semesters of 2000. Although the sample of this study is 4.52% of the target population and the subjects for this study may be representative of American students learning Chinese in China as a cultural group, the composition of the subjects was not sufficiently large to justify a generalization about all American students learning Chinese in China. Therefore, the findings of this study cannot be statistically generalizable as to the learning characteristics of all American students learning Chinese in China.

Second, two of the three research instruments used in this study, the Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory and the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale, were not specifically designed for American students learning a less commonly taught foreign language in a target language country but designed primarily for students learning commonly taught foreign languages in the U.S. They were chosen for this study because they were the most suitable instruments available at the time when this study was designed.

Third, the factor analysis included in this study should be reviewed as exploratory only. The limited number of participants in this study makes the participant to item ratios insufficient for a true factor analysis.

Fourth, since the subjects had come from different universities all over the U.S. and studied in different universities in China, the experiences in different Chinese programs in the universities in the U.S. and in China might have influenced them to respond differently.

Fifth, individual differences in linguistic capabilities and previous knowledge of Chinese language and culture were not controlled and might have influenced subjects' subjects to respond differently.

Sixth, although a substantial majority of the subjects enrolled in the Chinese programs for less than six months, some participants stayed in China for more than six months. The different terms and durations might have influenced their thoughts and opinions on some items differently.

Seventh, the Chinese study programs the subjects enrolled in China were not equivalent.

Eighth, since self-report measure instruments were used in this study, the results depended on subjects' ability and willingness to respond accurately to the items.

Recommendations for Further Research

There are several recommendations for further research. First, the findings of this study differed considerable from some other studies using the BALLI and the FLCAS. The differences might result from learning a less commonly taught foreign language in the target language country or from just learning Chinese in China. Therefore, before any generalization can be made, a replication of this study in a similar environment of learning less commonly taught foreign languages in the target language countries, such as learning Chinese in China and Taiwan, learning Japanese in Japan, or learning Arabic in Arabian countries is necessary.

Second, in order to more thoroughly explore and expound the subjects' reasons for learning Chinese, beliefs about language learning and foreign language anxiety, future research should involve interviews and observations of subjects to get more in-depth information.

Third, this study found that the ethnic language and culture backgrounds played an important role in American students studying Chinese in China. Future research should explore if ethnic language and culture backgrounds play a similar role in other foreign languages learners, including learners of both commonly and less commonly taught foreign languages as well as domestic and foreign environments.

Fourth, since the findings of this study came from American students studying Chinese in China and no similar study has been done in the U.S., future research should focus on learners of Chinese in the U.S. at home and abroad to find similarities and differences among learners of Chinese in domestic and foreign environments.

Fifth, since the subjects in this study have various Chinese levels, it would be useful to determine whether learners of Chinese with different Chinese levels have different motivations towards learning Chinese, beliefs about language learning and foreign language anxiety.

Sixth, because of the small population of American students studying Chinese in China and the small sample available in this study, especially students enrolled in long-term Chinese programs, this study did not divide the subjects according to the different durations of studying Chinese in China. Future research with large samples may divide subjects based on their duration in target language countries and find if there are important differences among them.

Seventh, because of the rapidly increase of Non-Asian students of Chinese, future research needs to pay special attention to them and explore their differences from other students and find their special needs.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM

Motivation, beliefs about language leaning and foreign language anxiety: A study of American students learning Chinese in China

You are invited to participate in a study on motivation, beliefs about language leaning and foreign language anxiety among American university students studying Chinese in China. My name is Jiayong Le, and I am a graduate student at the University of Texas at Austin in the Foreign Language Education Program. My sponsoring faculty and doctoral supervisor is professor Elaine Horwitz, Ph.D. This study will be done for my dissertation. You were selected as a potential participant in this study because you are an American university student studying Chinese in China.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to fill out three questionnaires. There are no right or wrong answers. This study will provide an interesting opportunity for you to understand what you think and feel about learning a less commonly taught foreign language abroad.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect you in any way. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time. All information obtained in this study from participants will remain in total confidentiality. Only my supervisor Dr. Elaine Horwitz and I will have access to this information. No personal information will be revealed to third parties without your permission.

If you have any questions, please feel free to ask me. If you like, I will discuss the result of the study with you when it is concluded. You may also contact me, Jiayong Le, or my supervisor Dr. Elaine Horwitz at the following addresses and telephone numbers if you have any questions later.

Jiayong Le
3375 Lake Austin Blvd. # C
Austin, Texas 78703
(512) 320-9925

Jiayong Le
Rm 206, No. 158
Peng Pu Xin Cun
Shanghai 200435
(8621) 5683-0733

Dr. Elaine Horwitz
The University of Texas at Austin
Foreign Language Education, SZB528
Austin, Texas 78712-1295
(512) 471-4078

_____ _____

Signature of Participant Date

_____ _____

Signature of Investigator Date

APPENDIX B

BACKGROUND QUESTIONAIRE

Please answer the following questions or check the appropriate response. This is for research purposes only and your responses will be kept confidential at all times.

1. What is your sex and age?
(1). Male_____
(2). Female_____
(3). Age_____

2. What is your ethnicity?
(1). White_____
(2). Black_____
(3). Hispanic_____
(4). American Indian_____
(5). Asian or Pacific Islander (except Chinese)_____
(6). Chinese born in the U.S._____ or in mainland China or Taiwan _____ or in other countries (specific)_____.
(7). Other (specific)_____

3. What year are you in?
(1). Freshman_____
(2). Sophomore_____
(3). Junior_____
(4). Senior_____
(5). Graduate_____
(6). Other (specific)_____

4. How long have you been in China?
(1). Less than one year_____
(2). One or two years_____
(3). Three or four years_____
(4). More than 5 years_____

5. At what age and where did you start to study Chinese?
(1)_____ (age)
(2)_____(country)

6.How many years have you studied Chinese?
(1). Less than one year_____
(2). One or two years_____
(3). Three or four years_____
(4). More than 5 years_____

7. Have you studied other languages other than English and Chinese?
Yes_____ No_____
If yes,
(1). Which language/languages did you study? _____
(2). How long did you study? _____
(3). At what age did you start to study? _____

8. If yes, do you consider yourself a good language learner?
(1). Not at all_____
(2). Not very _____.
(3). Slightly_____
(4). Fairly_____
(5). Very much_____

9. Have you ever traveled to or lived in a foreign language country (except China)? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, which country? _____
for how many years?_____

10. What is your native language?
(1). English _____
(2). Spanish_____
(3). Chinese_____
(4). Japanese_____
(5). Other_____

11. What is your major or specialty?
(1). Humanities (specific)_____
(2). Social sciences (specific)_____
(3). Medical sciences (specific)_____
(4). Education (specific)_____
(5). Sciences (specific)_____
(6). Other (specific)_____

12. How many hours do you study Chinese outside of class per week?
(1). Less than 5 hours_____
(2). 5 to 10 hours_____
(3). 11 to 15 hours_____
(4). 16 to 20 hours_____
(5). More than 20 hours_____

13. For how many years did you study this language in your country?
(1). One year_____
(2). Two years_____
(3). Three years_____
(4). Four years or more_____

(4). I did not study this language in my country_____

14. Does anyone in your immediate family speak this language? Mark all those which apply.
(1). Yes, my parents (one or more)_____
(2). Yes, my grandparents (one or more)_____
(3). Yes, my brothers and/or sisters (one or more)_____
(4). No_____

15. Why do you want to learn Chinese? Mark all those which apply in the order of the importance.
(1). Influenced by parents or other family members _____
(2). Influenced by friends or relatives_____
(3). Interest in the language_____
(4). Interest in culture_____
(5). Required by major_____
(6). Required to take an elective to graduated_____
(7). Need for my future career goal_____
(8). Need for travel_____
(9). Other (list)_____

(16). Why do you choose to study Chinese in China? Mark all those which apply in the order of the importance.
(1). More interesting_____
(2). More effective_____
(3). An authentic environment_____
(4). An important experience for my future career_____
(5). My parents' requirement_____
(6). Friends' influenced _____
(7). Other (list)_____

17. My goal in learning Chinese to become fluent in
(1). Reading and writing_____
(2). Speaking and listening_____
(3). Both_____

18. Do you enjoy language learning?
Yes_____ No_____

19. How do you rate your overall proficiency in Chinese language as compared with the

proficiency of other students in your class?
Excellent_____ Good_____ Fair_____ Poor_____

20. What do you rate your overall proficiency in Chinese as compared with the proficiency of native speakers of Chinese?
Excellent_____ Good_____ Fair_____ Poor_____

APPENDIX C

BELIEFS ABOUT LANGUAGE LEARNING INVENTORY

Below are beliefs that some people have about learning foreign languages. Read each statement and then decide if you: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree. There are no right or wrong answers. Please share your honest opinion and circle the right number.

1. It is easier for children than adults to learn a foreign language.
   1 2 3 4 5

2. Some people have a special ability for learning foreign languages.
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Some languages are easier to learn than others.
   1 2 3 4 5

4. Chinese is:
(1) a very difficult language
(2) a difficult language
(3) a language of medium difficulty
(4) an easy language
(5) a very easy language

5. I believe that I will ultimately learn to speak this language very well.
   1 2 3 4 5

6. People from my country are good at learning foreign languages.
   1 2 3 4 5

7. It is important to speak Chinese with excellent pronunciation.
   1 2 3 4 5

8. It is necessary to know about Chinese cultures in order to learn to speak Chinese well.
   1 2 3 4 5

9. You shouldn't say anything in Chinese until you can say it correctly.
   1 2 3 4 5

10. It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one.
    1 2 3 4 5

11. People who are good at mathematics or science are not good at learning foreign languages.
    1 2 3 4 5

12. It is best to learn Chinese in an Chinese speaking country.
1 2 3 4 5

13. I enjoy practicing Chinese with Chinese people that I meet.
1 2 3 4 5

14. It's O.K. to guess if you don't know a word in Chinese.
1 2 3 4 5

15. If someone spent one hour a day learning a language, how long would it take them to speak the language very well:

(1) Less than a year
(2) 1-2 years
(3) 3-5 years
(4) 5-10 years
(5) You can't learn a language in one hour a day

16. I have a special ability for learning foreign languages.
1 2 3 4 5

17. The most important part of learning a foreign language is learning vocabulary words.
1 2 3 4 5

18. It is important to repeat and practice a lot.
1 2 3 4 5

19. Women are better than men at learning foreign languages.
1 2 3 4 5

20. People in my country feel that it is important to speak Chinese.
1 2 3 4 5

21. I feel timid speaking English with other people. 1
2 3 4 5

22. If beginning students are permitted to make errors in Chinese, it will be difficult for them to speak correctly later on.
1 2 3 4 5

23. The most important part of reaming a foreign language is learning the grammar.
1 2 3 4 5

24. I would like to learn Chinese so that I can get to know Chinese people better.
1 2 3 4 5

25. It is easier to speak than understand a foreign language.
    1 2 3 4 5

26. It is important to practice with cassettes or tapes.
    1 2 3 4 5

27. Learning a foreign language is different than learning other academic subjects.
    1 2 3 4 5

28. The most important part of learning Chinese is learning how to translate from my native language.
    1 2 3 4 5

29. If I learn Chinese very well, I will have better opportunities for a good job.
    1 2 3 4 5

30. People who speak more than one language are very intelligent.
    1 2 3 4 5

31. I want to learn to speak Chinese well.
    1 2 3 4 5

32. I would like to have Chinese friends.
    1 2 3 4 5

33. Everyone can learn to speak a foreign language.
    1 2 3 4 5

34. It is easier to read and write Chinese than to speak and understand it.
    1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX D

BALLI PLUS

35. I want to learn to write Chinese well.
    1 2 3 4 5

36. Students should start with Roman letter (pinyin) when they begin to learn Chinese.
    1 2 3 4 5

37. Chinese Characters should be introduced as early as possible.
    1 2 3 4 5

38. I believe that the pronunciation of Chinese is the most difficult part of learning Chinese.
    1 2 3 4 5

39. I believe that learning Chinese Characters is the most difficult part of learning Chinese.
    1 2 3 4 5

40. I believe that if I can recognize the meaning of the Chinese characters, it is not important to be able to write the Chinese characters.
    1 2 3 4 5

41. I believe that if I want to learn Chinese well I must study Chinese aboard.
    1 2 3 4 5

42. The methods of Chinese language teaching are more effective in China than in the U.S.
    1 2 3 4 5

43. Instruction of Chinese language class in China is more interesting than those in the U.S.
    1 2 3 4 5

44. Compared with Chinese language class, learning Chinese in Chinese society is more important and useful.
    1 2 3 4 5

45. Overall, my Chinese language study program in China is excellent.

1 2 3 4 5

46. Chinese language teachers in China are better overall than those in the U.S.
1 2 3 4 5
47. Do you have any other beliefs about learning Chinese, which are not mentioned above?
1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX E

FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM ANXIETY SCALE

Directions: This section contains items that may reflect your feelings about your Chinese class. Please read each item and indicate (circle the number) whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) neutral, (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree.

1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my Chinese class.
   1 2 3 4 5

2. I don't worry about making mistakes in my Chinese class.
   1 2 3 4 5

3. I tremble when I know that I' m going to be called on in my Chinese class.
   1 2 3 4 5

4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in the Chinese class.
   1 2 3 4 5

5. It wouldn't bother me at all to take more Chinese language classes.
   1 2 3 4 5

6. During Chinese class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.
   1 2 3 4 5

7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at Chinese than I am.
   1 2 3 4 5

8. I am usually at ease during tests in my Chinese class.
   1 2 3 4 5

9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in Chinese class.
   1 2 3 4 5

10. I worry about the consequences of failing my Chinese class.
    1 2 3 4 5

11. I don't understand why some people get so upset over Chinese class.
    1 2 3 4 5

12. In Chinese class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.
    1 2 3 4 5

13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my Chinese class.
1 2 3 4 5

14. I would not be nervous speaking the Chinese language with native speakers.
1 2 3 4 5

15. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.
1 2 3 4 5

16. Even if I am well prepared for Chinese class, I feel anxious about it.
1 2 3 4 5

17. I often feel like not going to my Chinese class.
1 2 3 4 5

18. I feel confident when I speak in my Chinese class.
1 2 3 4 5

19. I am afraid that my Chinese teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.
1 2 3 4 5

20. I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in my Chinese class.
1 2 3 4 5

21. The more I study for a Chinese test, the more confused I get.
1 2 3 4 5

22. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for my language class.
1 2 3 4 5

23. I always feel that the other students speak the Chinese language better than I do.
1 2 3 4 5

24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking Chinese in front of other students.
1 2 3 4 5

25. Chinese class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.
1 2 3 4 5

26. I feel more tense and nervous in my Chinese class than in my other classes.
1 2 3 4 5

27. I get nervous and confused when 1 am speaking in my Chinese class.
1 2 3 4 5

28. When I am on my way to Chinese class, I feel very sure and relaxed.
1 2 3 4 5

29. I get nervous when I don't understand every word the Chinese teacher says.
1 2 3 4 5

30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak Chinese.
1 2 3 4 5

31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak Chinese.
1 2 3 4 5

32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speaks of Chinese.
1 2 3 4 5

33. I get nervous when the Chinese teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.
1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX F

CHANGES IN THE BALLI AND THE FLCAS

1. CHANGES IN THE BALLI FROM HORWITZ (1987)

Item	Modification
4. "English"	"Chinese"
6. "my country"	" the U.S."
7. "English"	"Chinese"
8. "English-speaking cultures in order to learn to speak English"	"Chinese culture in order to learn to speak Chinese"
9. "English"	"Chinese"
12. "English in an English-speaking"	"Chinese in a Chinese-speaking"
13. "English with Americans"	"Chinese with Chinese people"
14. "English"	"Chinese"
20. "English"	"Chinese"
22. "English"	"Chinese"
24. "to learn English so that I can get to Americans"	"to learn Chinese so that I can get to know Chinese people"
29. "English"	"Chinese"
31. "English"	"Chinese"
32. "American"	"Chinese"
34. "English"	"Chinese"

2. CHANGES IN THE FLCAS FROM HORWITZ (1983B)

Item	Modification
1. "in my foreign language"	"in my Chinese class"
2. "language"	"Chinese"
3. "language class"	"my Chinese class"
4. "in the foreign language"	"in the Chinese class"
5. "foreign"	"Chinese"
6. "language"	"Chinese"
7. "language"	"Chinese"
8. "language"	"Chinese"
9. "language"	"Chinese"
10. "foreign language"	"Chinese"
11. "foreign language classes"	"Chinese class"
12. "language"	"Chinese"
13. "language"	"Chinese"
14. "foreign"	"Chinese"
16. "language"	"Chinese"
17. "language"	"Chinese"
18. "foreign language"	"Chinese"
19. "language"	"Chinese"
20. "language"	"my Chinese"
21. "language"	"Chinese"
23. "foreign"	"Chinese"

24.	“the foreign language”	“Chinese”
25.	“language”	“Chinese”
26.	“language”	“Chinese”
27.	“language”	“Chinese”
28.	“language”	“Chinese”
29.	“language”	“Chinese”
30.	“foreign language”	“Chinese”
31.	“the foreign language”	“Chinese”
32.	“the foreign language”	“Chinese”
33.	“language”	“Chinese”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, R. G., & Vann, R. J. (1987). Strategies of two language learners: A case study. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning (pp.* 85-102). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of Foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *Modern Language Journal. 78,* 155-168.

Aldwin, C., & Greenberger, E. (1987). Cultural differences in the predictors of depression. *American Journal of Community Psychology. 15*, 789-813.

Alpert, R., & Haper, R. (1960). Anxiety in academic achievement situations. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61*, 207-215.

Au, S.Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's social psychological theory of second-language learning. *Language Learning, 38,* 75-100

Bailey, K. M. (1983). Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning: Looking at and through the diary studies. In H.W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 67-102). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Bailey, P., Daley, C.E., & Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (1999). Foreign language anxiety and learning style. *Foreign Language Annals, 32*, 63-76.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist. 37,* 122-147.

Barcelos, A. M. F. (1995). *A cultura de aprender lingua estrangeria (ingles) de alunos de letras (The culture of learning a foreign language (English) of language students).* Unpublished master's thesis, UNICAMP, Sao Paulo, Brazil.

Benson, P. & Lor. W. (1999). Conceptions of language and language learning. *System. 27(4),* 459-472.

Berg, I. K., & Jaya, A. (1993). Different and same: Family therapy with Asian American Families. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 19 (1)*, 31-38.

Bills, G. (1997). Language shift, linguistic variation, and teaching Spanish to native speakers in the United States. In M.C. Colombi & F.X. Alarcon

(Eds.), *La ensenanza del espanol a hispanohablantes. Praxis y teoria* (pp. 263-82). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Bi, J. W. (1986). The role of introducing Chinese culture in teaching Chinese as a foreign language. (Zhongguo wenhua jieshao zai duiwai hanyu jiaoxue zhong de zuoyong). In the First International Symposium of Chinese Teaching (Di yi jie guoji hanyu jiaoxue taolun hui) (Ed.), *Selected papers of the First International Symposium of Chinese Teaching. (Di yi jie guoji hanyu jiaoxue taolun hui lunwen xuan).* Beijing: Beijing Languages Institute. Publishing House. (pp. 554-562).

Brod, R., & Welles, E. B. (2000). Foreign Language Enrollments in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1998. *ADFL Bulletin, 31 (2),* 22-29.

Brown, H.D. (1973). Affective variables in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 23,* 231-244.

Brown, H.D. (2000). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (0ª Ed.). *Englewood Cliffs,* NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Burn, B. B. (1990). The Contribution of International Educational Exchange to the International Education of Americans: Projections for the Year 2000. *Occasional Papers on International Education Exchange. Forum Series 26*. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange.

Burn, B. B., Jerry, S. C., et al. (1990). *Study abroad: The experience of American undergraduates.* West-port, Ct.: Greenwood Press.

Burnaby, B., & Sun, Y. (1989). Chinese teachers' views of western language teaching: Context informs paradigms. *TESOL Quarterly, 23 (2),* 219-238.

Byram, M. (1988). Foreign Language Education and Cultural Studies. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 1 (1),* 15-31.

Campbell, R. (1996). New learners and new challenges. In R.C. Lafayette (Ed.), *"National standards: A catalyst for reform"* (pp. 97-117). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Carlson, J. S., Burn, B.B., Useem, J., Yachimowicz, D. (1990). *Study abroad: The experience of American undergraduates.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Carrell, P.L. (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading: *Modern Language Journal, 73*, 121-134.

Casado, Matt A, & Dereshiwsky, M. I. (2001). Foreign language anxiety of university students. *College Student Journal, 35 (4)*, 539-550.

Clément, R., Gardner, R.C., & P. C. Smythe (1977). Motivational variables in second language acquisition: a study of Francophones learning English. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science. 9*. 123-33.

Clément, R., Major, L. J., Gardner, R.C., & Smythe, P. C. (1977). Attitudes and motivation in second language acquisition: An investigation of Ontario Francophones. *Working Papers on Bilingualism. 12*. 1-20.

Chen, H. (1996). *A study of the effect of corrective feedback on foreign language learning: American students learning Chinese classifiers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Chen, S. (1984). An analysis of I11-formed sentences in Chinese by Chinese by second language learners. *Language Learning and Communication: A Journal of Applied Linguistics in Chinese and English, 3 (3),* 257-271.

Chen, Y.E. (2000). Motivation and language learning strategies in learning English as a second language (Doctoral dissertation, University Washington, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60,* 23-66.

Chi, T. R. (1989). Observations on the past, present, and future of teaching Mandarin Chinese as a foreign language. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association, 24 (2),* 109-122.

Christensen, M., & Wu, X. (1993). An individualized approach for teaching false beginners. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 28,* 91-100.

Chu, C. (1990). Semantics and discourse in Chinese language instruction. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 25,* 15-29.

Condly, S.J. (1999). *Motivation to learn and to succeed: A path analysis of the CANE model of cognitive motivation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Cortazzi. M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 169-203). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System. 23 (2),* 195-205.

Cotterall, S. (1999). Key variables in language learning: What do learners believe about them? *System. 27(4),* 493-513.

Coulombe, D. (2000). *Anxiety and beliefs of French-as-a-second-language learners at the university level.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Laval, Quebec, Canada.

Cowan, J. R., Richard L. L., Mathews B. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1979). English teaching in China: A recent survey. *TESOL Quarterly, 13 (4),* 465-482.

Cramer, D., & Fong, J. (1991). Effect of rational beliefs on intensity and "inappropriateness" of feelings: A test of Rational-Emotive Theory. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 15 (4)*, 319-329.

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41 (4),* 469-512.

Valdes, G. (1997). The teaching of Spanish to bilingual Spanish-speaking students: Outstanding issues and unanswered questions. In M.C. Colombi & F.X. Alarcon (Eds.), *"La ensenanza del espanol a hispanohablantes. Praxis y teoria"* (pp. 93-101). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Davis, T. M. (Ed.). (1998). Open doors 1997-1998: *Report on international edcucational exchange.* New York: Institute of International Education.

Deffenbacher, J., Zwerner, W., Whisman, M., Hill, R., & Sloan, R. (1986). Irrational beliefs and anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 10 (3)*, 281-292.

Desruisseaux, P. (1993). A Foreign-Student Record; Fact File: Foreign Students in U.S. Institutions. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 40 (15),* pA42-43 Dec 1.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1998). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95,* 256-273.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think.* Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath

Dewey, J. (1983). *The middle works* 1899-1924. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dzau, Y. F. (1990). *English in China,* Hong Kong: API Press.

Eccles, J. (1983). Expectances, values and academic behavior. In J.T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and Achievement Motives* (pp. 75-146). San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Eccles, J., & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: The structure of adolescents' achievement task values and expectancy-related beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 215-225.

Eddy, P. (1980*). Chinese Language Study in American Higher Education: State of the Art. Final Report.* (ED185869)

Ehrman, M.E. (1996). An exploration of adult language learning motivation, self-efficacy, and anxiety. In R.L. Oxford (Ed), *Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to the New Century* (pp. 81-103). Manoa, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Elbaum, B. E., Berg, C. A., & Dodd, D. H. (1993). Previous learning experiences. strategy beliefs, and task definition in self-regulated foreign language learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 18 (3),* 318-336.

Ellis, A. (1962). *Reason and emotion in psychotherapy*. N.Y: Lyle Stuart.

Ellis, F.L. (1997). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ely, C. M. (1986). An analysis of discomfort, risktaking, sociability, and motivation in the L2 classroom. *Language Learning. 36,* 1-25.

Endler, N. S. (1975). A person-situation interaction model of anxiety. In Spielberger, C. D. & Sarason, I. G. (Eds.), *Stress and Anxiety* (pp. 145-164). Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.

Endler, N. S. (1983). Interactionism: A personality model, but not yet a theory. In M. M. Page (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation 1982: *Personality--Current Theory and Research* (pp. 155-200). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Endler, N. S. (1988). Hassles, health and happiness. In M. P. Janisse (Ed.), Individual Differences. *Stress & Health Psychology* (pp. 24-56). New York: Springer.

Endler, N. S. (1997). Stress, anxiety and coping: The multidimensional interaction model. *Canadian Psychology, 38*, 136-153.

Endler, N. S., Edwards, J. M., Vitelli, R. & Parker, J. D. A. (1989). Assessment of state and trait anxiety: Endler Multidimensional Anxiety Scales. *Anxiety Research, 2*, 1-14.

Everson, M. E. (1986). *The effect of word-unit spacing upon the reading strategies of native and L2 readers of Chinese: An eye-tracking study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University., Columbus.

Everson, M. E. (1988). Speed and comprehension in reading Chinese: Romanization vs. characters revisited. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 23 (2)*, 1-16.

Eysenck, M. W. (1979). Anxiety, learning and memory: A reconceptualization. *Journal of Research in Personality. 13,* 363-385.

Foss, K. A., & Reitzel, A.C. (1988). A relational model for managing second language anxiety. *TESOL Quarterly, 22 (3),* 437-454.

Freud, S. (1936). *The problem of Anxiety.* New York: Norton.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation.* London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. (1988). The socio-educational model of second language learning: Assumptions, findings and issues. *Language Learning, 38,* 101-126.

Gardner, R. C. (1991). Second language learning in adults: correlates of proficiency. *Applied Language Learning, 2,* 1-28.

Gardner, R. C. (1992). Integrative motivation, induced anxiety, and language learning in a controlled environment. *Studies in second language acquisition, 14 (2),* 197-214.

Gardner, R. C., Lalonde, R.N., & Pierson, R. (1983). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: An investigation using LISREL causal modeling. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 2*, 51-65.

Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology. 13*, 266-72.

Gardner, R.C., & Lambent, W.E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1987). The role of anxiety in second language performance of language dropouts. *Research Bulletin No. 657*. London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P.D. (1991). An instrumental motivation in language study. Who says it isn't effective? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 57-72.

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P.D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning, 43,* 157-194.

Gardner, R. C., Masgoret A., & Tremblay F. P. (1999). Home background characteristics and second language learning. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18 (4),* 419-437.

Gardner, R. C., Moorcroft, R., & Maclntyre, P. D. (1987). *The role of anxiety in second language performance of language dropouts* (Research Bulletin No. 657.) London, Ontario: The University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1975). *Second language acquisition: A social psychological approach.* (Research Bulletin No. 332.*)* London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., & Clément, R. (1979). Intensive second language study in a bicultural milieu: An investigation of attitudes, motivation and language proficiency. *Language Learning, 29*. 305-320.

Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., Clément, R. & L. Glicksman (1976). Second language learning: A social-psychological perspective. *Canadian Modem Language Journal.* 32 (3), 198-213.

Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P.C., & Lalonde, R. N. (1984). *The nature and replicability of factors in second language acquisition.* (Research Bulletin No. 605). London, Ontario: The University of Western Ontario.

Gliksman, L. (1981). *Improving the prediction of behaviors associated with second language acquisition.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada.

Gliksman, L., Gardner, R.C., & Smythe, P.C. (1982). The role of the integrative motives on students' participation in the French classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 14*, 625-635.

Goodwin, C. D., and Nacht, M. (1988). *Abroad and beyond.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K.(2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *Modern Language Journals, 86 (4),* 562-570.

Guthrie, G. (1985). *A school divided: an ethnography of bilingual education in a Chinese community. Hillsdale*, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hannas, W. (1995). Teaching Chinese teachers what constitutes Chinese. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 30*, 100-107

Harvey, P. (1985). A lesson to be learned: Chinese approaches to language learning. *ELT Journal 39 (3),* 183-186.

Hayes, E.B.(1988). Encoding strategies used by native and L2 readers of Chinese mandarin. *Modern Language Journal 72,* 188-95.

He, A. (1999): Socialization through teacher's directives: cases from Chinese heritage language classrooms in the US Paper presented at 1999 *American Association for Applied Linguistics, Stamford, CT,* 6-9.

Himle, D., Thyler, B., & Papsdorf, J. (1982). Relationships between rational beliefs and anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 6 (2)*, 219-223.

Hinenoya, K. & Gatbonton, E. (2000). Ethnocentrism, cultural traits, beliefs, and English proficiency: A Japanese sample. *Modern Language Journal, 84 (2)*, 225-240.

Hoffa, B. (1994). *Study abroad 1776-1994 and beyond, Peterson's study abroad 1994* (pp.3-5). Princeton, New Jersey: Peterson's Guides Inc.

Holec. H. (1987). The learner as manager: managing learning or managing to learn'? In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 145-156). London: Prentice Hall.

Horwitz, E. K. (1983a). *Beliefs about language learning inventory.* Unpublished instrument. The University of Texas at Austin.

Horwitz, E. K. (1983b). *Foreign language classroom anxiety scale.* Unpublished manuscript. The University of Texas at Austin.

Horwitz, E.K. (1985). Using student beliefs about language learning and teaching in the foreign language methods course. *Foreign Language Annals, 18*, 333-340.

Horwitz, E. K. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *TESOL Quarterly. 20*, 559-562.

Horwitz, E. K. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 119-129). London: Prentice-Hall.

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *Modern Language Journal. 72.* 283-294.

Horwitz, E. K. (1990). Attending to the affective domain in the foreign language classroom. In S.S. Mognan (Ed.), *Shifting the instructional focus to the learner* (pp.15-33) Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Language.

Horwitz, E. K. (1999). Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning. A review of BALLI studies. *System, 27 (4),* 557-576.

Horwitz. E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 112-126.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. A. (1986). Foreign Language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal, 70.* 125-132.

Huang, S. C. (1997). *Taiwanese senior high school students' EFL learning: Focus on Learning strategies and learning beliefs.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.

Huang, S.C., & Chang, S.F. (1998). Self-efficacy of English as a second language learners: An example of four learners. *Journal of Intensive English Studies, 12*, 23-40.

Huber, B. J. (1996). Variation in Foreign Language Enrollments through Time (1970-90), *ADFL Bulletin, 27 (2),* 57-84.

Hudson, G. (2000). *Essential Introductory Linguistics.* United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers.

Hurt, L. C. (1997). *Learning French in the inner city: Beliefs and attitudes of eighth-grade students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University.

IIE (2001). *Open doors: Americans studying abroad.* Institute of International Education. Received July 18, 2002, from http://www.opendoors.iienetwork.org

IIE (2002). *Open doors: Americans studying abroad.* Institute of International Education. Received June 10, 2003, from http://www.opendoors.iienetwork.org

IIE (2004). *Open doors: Americans studying abroad.* Institute of International Education. Received Feb 23, 2004, from http://www.opendoors.iienetwork.org

Ishii, S. (1978). *Communication apprehension of Japanese and Americans in three speaking situations.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association.

Izard. M., & Smith, P. (1982). *Between belief and transgression: Structuralist essays in religion, history and myth.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

James. W. (1991). *Pragmatism*. New York: Prometheus

Jen, T. (1997). *Error analysis and its application to Chinese language teaching.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University.

Johnson, S.B. (1993). *Going back to school: Characteristics, motivation deterrents, and needs of adult male reentry students at a community college.* University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL.

Kern, R. G. (1995). Students' and Teachers' Beliefs About Language Learning. *Foreign language Annals: 28*. 71-92.

Kim-Yoon, H. (2000). *Learners beliefs about language learning, motivation and their relationship: A study of EFL learners in Korea.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

King, L. J., & Young, J. A. (1994). Study abroad: Education for the 21 st century. *Unterrichtspraxis, 27 (1)*, 77-87.

Kleinmann, H. H. (1977). Avoidance behavior in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning: 27*. 93-107.

Koch, A. S., & Terrell, T. D. (1991). Affective reactions of foreign language students to natural approach activities and teaching techniques. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 109-126). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: PrenticeHall.

Kondo, K. (1999). Motivating bilingual and semibilingual university students of Japanese: An analysis of language learning persistence and intensity among students from immigrant backgrounds. *Foreign Language Annals, 32,* 77-88.

Kunt, N. (1997). *Anxiety and beliefs about language learning: A study of Turkish-speaking University students learning English in North Cyprus.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1982a). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1982b). Theory vs. practice in language training. In R.W. Blair (Ed.), *Innovative Approaches to Language Teaching* (pp. 15-30). Cambridge: Newbury House.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* London: Longman.

Kuntz. P. (1996). *University students' beliefs about foreign language learning, with a focus on Arabic and Swahili at U.S.HEA Title VI African Studies Centers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Lalonde, R. N., & Gardner, R.C. (1984). Investigating a causal model of second language acquisition: Where does personality fit? *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 16*, 224-237.

Lee, J.F. (1999). Clashes in L2 reading: Research versus practice and readers' misconceptions. In D.Y. Yong (Eds.), *Affect in Foreign Language and Second Language Learning: A Practical Guide to Creating a Low-Anxiety Classroom Atmosphere* (pp.49-63). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lewelling, V.W. ; Peyton, J. K (1999). *Spanish for Native Speakers: Developing Dual Language Proficiency. (*ED433696)

Li, W. (1996). *Second Language acquisition of topic-comment structures in Mandarin Chinese.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta

Linnell, J.D. (2001). Chinese as a second/foreign language teaching and research: changing classroom contexts and teacher choices. *Language Teaching Research 5 (1),* 54-81.

Liu, I. (1983). The learning of characters: A conceptual learning approach. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 19 (2),* 65-76.

Liu, J. (1992). Bridging language and culture: a cognitive approach to the study of Chinese characters. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 27*, 1-19.

Liu, Y. J. (1993). *Book of major educational events in China: 1949-1990. (Zhongguo jiaoyu da shidian)* (Ed.). Zhejiang Publishing House. (pp.1672-1673).

LoCastro, V. (1994). Learning strategies and learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly, 2,* 409-414.

LoCastro, V. (1995). The author responds. *TESOL Quarterly, 29 (1),* 172-175.

Lohr, J.M., & Bonge, D. (1981). On the distinction between illogical and irrational beliefs and their relationship to anxiety. *Psychological Reports,* 48, 191-194.

Lu, B. S. (1989). The development of the cause for teaching Chinese as a foreign language in China. (Wo guo duiwai hanyu jiaoxue shiye de fazhan). *Language teaching and studies (Yuyan jiaoxue yu yanjiu), 4,* 6-25.

Lucas, J. (1984). Communication apprehension in the ESL classroom: Getting our students to talk. *Foreign Language Annals, 17 (6),* 593-598.

Luppescu, S. & Day, R. R. (1990). Examining attitude in teachers and students: the need to validate questionnaire data. *Second Language Research. 6 (2).* 125-134.

Lutz, R. (1990). Classroom shock: The role of expectations in an instructional setting. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), *GURT 1990: Linguistics, language teaching and language acquisition: The interdependence of theory, practice and research* (pp. 144-156). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

MacIntyre, P. D. (1995a). How does anxiety affect second language learning? A reply to Sparks and Ganschow. *Modern Language Journal, 79*, 90-99.

MacIntyre, P. D. (1995b). On seeing the forest and the trees: A rejoinder to Sparks and Ganschow, *Modern Language Journal, 79,* 245-247.

MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: Toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning, 39 (2).* 251-275.

MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1991a). Methods and results in the study of anxiety and language learning: A review of the literature. *Language Learning. 41.* 85-117.

MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1991c). Investigating language class anxiety using the focused easy techniques. *Modern Language Journal, 75(3).* 296-313.

MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1994a). The effects of induced anxiety on three staged of cognitive processing in second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,16,* 1-17.

MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1994b). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning, 44*, 238-305.

MacIntyre, P.D., & Gardner, R.C. (1991b). Language Anxiety: Its relationship to other anxieties and to processing in native and second language. *Language learning, 41 (4),* 513-534.

MacIntyre, P.D., Nowels, K. A., & Clément, R. (1997). Biases in self-ratings of second language proficiency: The role of language anxiety. *Language learning, 47(2),* 265-287.

Madsen, H. S., Brown, B. L., & Jones, R. L. (1991). Evaluating student attitudes toward second-language tests. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 65-86). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mark, L.I. (1998). Deconstructing locus of control: Implications for practitioners. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 76,* 251-260.

Marsella, A., Kinize, D., & Gordon, P. (1973). Ethnic variations in the expression of depression. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 4*, 435-458.

McCargar, D.F. (1993). Teacher and student role expectations: Cross-cultural differences and implications. *Modern Language Journal, 77 (2),* 192-207.

McGinnis, S. (1994). The less common alternative: A report from the task force for teacher training in the less commonly taught languages. *ADFL Bulletin, 25 (2)*, 17-22.

Meara, P. (1994). The year abroad and its effects. *Language Learning Journal 10,* 32-40.

Meskill, J. ed. (1973). *An introduction to Chinese Civilization*: New York: Columbia University Press.

Miller. L. & Ginsberg, R. B. (1995). Folklinguistic theories of language learning. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 293-315). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Miller, M. B., Behrens, J. T., & Greene, B.A. (1993). Goals and perceived ability: Impact on student value, self-regulation and persistence. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Psychology, 18,* 2-14.

Milleret, M. (1990). Evaluation and the summer language program abroad: A review essay. *Modern Language Journal, 74 (4),* 483-488.

Miracel, W. C. (1989). Tone production of American students of Chinese: A preliminary acoustic study. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 25 (3)*, 49-66.

Mori, Y. (1999). Epistemological beliefs and language learning beliefs: What do language learners believe about their learning? *Language learning, 49 (3),* 317-416.

Mori, Y. (1999). Beliefs about language learning and their relationship to the ability to integrate information from word parts and context interpreting novel kanji words. *Modern Language Journal, 83 (4)*, 534-547.

Muchnick, A. G., & Wolfe, D. E. (1982). Attitudes and motivations of American students of Spanish. *The Canadian Modern Language Review. 38,* 262-281.

Myers, D. (1997). Teaching culture with language: words of foreign origin and linguistic purism. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 32,* 41-55.

Nguyen, S. D. (1982). Psychiatric and psychosomatic problems among Southeast Asian refugees. *The Psychiatric Journal of the University of Ottawa, 7,* 163-172.

Ning, C. (1983). *Resources for teaching Chinese as a second language: A survey of American Colleges and Universities*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Noels, K.A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L.G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *The Modern Language journal 83*, 23-34.

Norman, J. (1996). Leaning Chinese in the 1990s. *ADFL Bulletin, 27 (2),* 4-8.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered curriculum.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan. D. (1993). From learning-centeredness to learner-centeredness. *Applied Language Learning. 4 (1 & 2),* 1-18.

Okazaki, S., & Sue, S. (1990). Asian-American education achievements: A phenomenon in search of an explanation. *American Psychologist, 45(3)*, 913-920.

Onwuegbuzie, J. A., Bailey, P., & Daley, E.C. (1999). Factors associated with foreign language anxiety. *Applied Psycholinguistics 20*, 217-239.

Oettingen, G., Little, T.D., Lindenberger, U., & Baltes, P. B. (1994). Causality, agency and control beliefs in East versus West Berlin children: A natural experiment on the role of context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66,* 579-595.

Oh, M-J T. (1996) *Beliefs about language learning and foreign language anxiety: a study of American university students learning Japanese.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin.

Oxford, R., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal, 73,* 291-300.

Oxford. R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Packard, J. L. (1989). High-versus low-pressure methods of Chinese language teaching: A comparison of test results. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 24 (1),* 1-18.

Packard, J. L. (1990). Effects of time lag in the introduction of characters into the Chinese language curriculum. *Modern Language Journal 74*, 167-175.

Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational Research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62 (3),* 307-332.

Park, G. P. (1995). *Language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning of university students learning English in Korea.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.

Pease, J. (1996). Teaching Chinese at an Urban University. *ADFL Bulletin, 27 (2),* 9-13.

Penner, J. (1995). Change and conflict: Introduction of the communicative approach in China *TESL Canada Journal, 12 (2),* 1-13.

Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology. 82*, 33-40.

Pintrich, P. R.. Marx. R. W. & Boyle. R. A. (1993). Beyond conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. *Review of Educational Research. 63 (2),* 167-199.

Polio, C. (1994). Non-native speakers' use of nominal classifies in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 29*, 51-66.

Price, *M.* L. (1991). The subjective experience of foreign language anxiety: Interviews with highly anxious students. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 101-108). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Proulx, P. (1991). Anxiety in language learning: Recognition and prevention. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 18 (1),* 53-64.

Riley. P. (1994). Aspects of learner discourse: Why listening to learners is so important. In E. Esch (Ed.). *Self-access and the adult language learner* (pp. 7-18). London: Center for information on language teaching.

Riley. P. (1997). The guru and the conjurer: aspects of counselling for self-access. In Benson. P. & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 114-131). New York: Longman.

Rifkin, B. (2000). Revisiting beliefs about foreign language learning. *Foreign Language Annals 33 (4),* 394-420.

Robert, L.P. (1992). Attitudes of entering university freshmen toward foreign language study: A descriptive analysis. *The Modem Language Journal, 76*. 275-83.

Rodriguez, M. (1995). Foreign language classroom anxiety and students' success in EFL classes. *Revista Venezolana de Linguistica Aplicada, 1,* 23-32.

Ross, H. A. (1993). *China learns English: Language teaching and social change in the People's Republic.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs, 80* (1, Whole No. 609).

Saito, Y., Horwitz, E.K. & Garza, T. (1999). Foreign language reading anxiety. *Modern Language Journal, 83,* 202-218.

Sakui. K. & Gaies, S. J. (1999). Investigating Japanese Learners' beliefs about language learning. *System. 27(4),* 473-492.

anchez-Herrero, S. A., & Sanchez, M. P. (1992). The predictive validation of an instrument designed to measure student anxiety learning a foreign language. *Education & Psychological Measurement. 52 (4),* 961-966.

Samimy, K.K. & Lee, Y. (1997). Beliefs about language learning: Perspectives of first-year Chinese learners and their instructors. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association, 32 (1),* 40-60.

Samimy, K.K.& Tabuse, M. (1992). Affective variables and a less commonly taught language: A study in beginning Japanese classes. *Language Learning, 42,* 377-398.

Samimy, K. (1994). Adult language learners affective reactions to community language learning: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals, 27*, 379-390.

Schwarz, E. & Birn, H. (1995). Dental anxiety in Danish and Chinese adults--A cross-cultural perspective. *Social Science and Medicine, 41,* 123-130.

Scovel, T (1978). The effect of affect: A review of the anxiety literature. *Language learning.* 28. 129-142.

Sergent, W. K. (1990). *A study of the oral reading strategies of advanced and highly advanced second language readers of Chinese.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University., Columbus.

Shinnouchi, M. (2000). Gendai Gairaigo Jiaoo (The Situation Concerning Contemporary Loanwords). *Data and Statistics*, 510 -513.

Shen, S. X. (1989). Toward a register approach in teaching mandarin tones. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association 25 (3),* 27-48.

Shi, X., & Zhuang Q. M. (1990). A brief history of teaching Chinese as a foreign language. *Language International 2 (3).* 15-17.

Sparks, R., & Ganschow, L. (1991). Foreign language learning difficulties: Affective or native language aptitude differences? *Modern Language Journal, 75*, 3-6.

Sparks, R., & Ganschow, L.(1993a). The impact of native language learning problems on foreign language learning: Case study illustrations of the linguistic coding deficit hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal, 77*, 58-74.

Sparks, R., & Ganschow, L.(1993b). Searching for the cognitive locus of foreign language learning difficulties: Linking first and second language learning. *Modern Language Journal, 77*, 289-302.

Sparks, R., Ganschow, L., Artzer, M., Siebenhar, D., & Plageman, M. (1997). Anxiety and proficiency in a foreign language. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 85,* 559-562.

Sparks, R., Ganschow, L., Artzer, M., Siebenhar, D., & Plageman, M. (1998). Differences in native language skills, foreign language aptitude, and foreign language grades among high, average, and low proficiency foreign language learners: Two studies. *Language Testing, 15*, 181-216.

Sparks, R., Ganschow, L., & Javorsky, J. (1995). I know one when I see one. (Or, I know one because I am one): A response to Mabbott. *Foreign Language Annals, 28,* 479-487.

Sparks, R., Ganschow, L., & Javorsky, J.(2000). Déjà vu all over again: A response to Saito, Horwitz, and Garza. *Modern Language Journal, 84,* 251-255.

Speilberger, C. D. (1983). *Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory (Form Y).* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Spielberger, C. D. (1966). *Anxiety and behavior.* New York.

Spielberger, C. D. (1972). *Anxiety-current trends in theory and research.* New York: Academic Press.

Spitalli, E.J. (2000). *The relationship between foreign language anxiety and attitudes toward multiculturalism in high-school students.* Unpublished master's thesis, Benedictine University, Lisle, IL.

Steinberg. L., Dornbusch, S.M., & Brown, B.B. (1992). Ethnic differences in adolescent achievement: An ecological perspective. *American Psychologist, 47,* 723-729.

Stevenson, H. W., Lee, S, Chen, C. Lummis, AM., Stigler, J., Fan, L., & Ge, R. (1991). Mathematics achievement of children in China and the United States. *Child Development, 6l,* 1953-1966.

Stigler, J.W., Smith, S., & Mao, L. (1985). The self perception of competence by Chinese children. *Child Development, 56,* 1259-1270.

Strong, G., (1992). *Curriculum Implementation in China.* (ED353818)

Su. D. (1995). *A study of English learning strategies and styles of Chinese university students in relation to their cultural beliefs about learning English* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Su, I. (1998). *Transfer of sentence processing strategies: a comparison of L2 learners of Chinese and English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii.

Sue, D. W. & Morishima, J. K. (1982). *The mental health of Asian Americans.* San Francisco. CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sue, D., & Kirk, B. (1973). Differential characteristics of Japanese-American and Chinese-American college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20 (2),* 142-148.

Swaffar, J. K. (1989). Rethinking Roles: Western and Eastern Languages in the Foreign Language Academy. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association, 24 (2)*, 123-134.

Tobias, S. (1979). Anxiety research in educational psychology. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71,* 573-582.

Tobias, S. (1986). Anxiety and cognitive processing of instruction. In *R.* Schwarzer (Ed.), *Self-related cognition in anxiety and motivation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Thompson, W. C., & Peltier, M. D.(1990). The education of military officers in the Federal Republic.. *Armed Forces & Society, Summer 90, 16 (4),* 587-607.

Truitt, S. N. (1995). *Anxiety and Beliefs About Language Learning: A Study of Korean Universitv Students Learning English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin.

Trylong, V. L. (1987). *Aptitude. attitudes. and anxiety: A study of their relationships to achievement in the foreign language classroom.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Tsai, C. (2003). *Anxiety and beliefs about language learning: A study of Taiwanese college students learning English (China).* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, Kingsville.

Tucker G., Hamayan, R., and Genesee, F. H (1976). Affective, cognitive, and social factors in second language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review. 32,* 214-226.

Tumposky. Nj. (1991). Student beliefs about language learning: A cross-cultural study. *Carleton Papers in Applied Language Studies, 8.* 50-65.

Uba, L. (1994). *Asian Americans: Personality Patterns, Identity., and Mental Health.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Vann, R. J., & Abraham, R. G. (1990). Strategies of unsuccessful and language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 24,* 177-198.

Victori, M., Lockhart, W. (1995). Enhancing metacognition in self-directed language learning. *System, 23*, 223-234.

Wadley, S. (1987). *A translation of the 'Lao Qida' and investigation into certain of its syntactic structure*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Walker, G. (1989). The less commonly taught languages in the context of American pedagogy. pp. 111-37 in H.S. Lepke (Ed.), *Shaping the future: Opportunities and challenges*. Report of the Northeast Conference on the teaching of foreign languages. Middlebury, VT: The Northeast Conference.

Walton, A. R. (1989). Chinese language instruction in the United States: Some reflections on the state of the art. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association, 24,* 1-42.

Wang, G. C. (1989). Research on teaching Chinese in forty-five universities: Analysis of survey results. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association, 24 (3),* 101-113.

Wang, K. (1981). English and other foreign language teaching in the People's Republic of China. *College English, 43 (7),* 651-662.

Wang, X. (1995). Second language acquisition of the Chinese article 'Le'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics 5*: 45-62.

Wang, X. J. (1995). *Chinese syntactic systems and second language acquisition: approaches to the teaching of Chinese as a second language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.

Wang, S.Y. (1996). *A study of Chinese college English majors' beliefs about language learning and their learning strategies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University.

Wang, X. J. (1996). *A view from within: a case study of Chinese heritage community language schools in the U.S*. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center

Weiner, B. (1979). A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71,* 3-25.

Weiner, B. (1990). History of motivational research in education. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82,* 616-22.

Welles, E.B. (2004). Foreign language enrollments in United States institutions of higher education, fall 2002. *ADFL Bulletin, 35(2-3),* 7-26.

Wenden, A. L. (1986a). Helping language learners think about learning. *English Language Teaching Journal, 40*. 3-12.

Wenden, A. L. (1986b). What do second-language learners know about their language learning? A second look at retrospective accounts. *Applied Linguistics, 7,* 186-201.

Wenden, A. L. (1987). How to be a successful language learner: Insights and prescriptions from L2 learners. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 103-117). London: Prentice-Hall.

Wenden. A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. London: Prentice Hall

Wenden. A. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics. 19 (4)*, 515 - 537.

Wang, X. J. (1995). *Chinese syntactic systems and second language acquisition: approaches to the teaching of Chinese as a second language.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.

Wang, X. J. (1996). A view from within: a case study of Chinese heritage community language schools in the U.S. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.

Wen, X. (1995). Second language acquisition of the Chinese particle 'Le'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 5, 45-62.

Wen, X. (1997). Motivation and language learning with students of Chinese. *Foreign Language Annals, 30 (2),* 235-251.

Wu, S.R. (2003). *A comparison of learners' beliefs about writing in their first and second language: Taiwanese junior college business-major students studying English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin.

Xu, Z. Y. (1986). Some problems caused by differences of cultural backgrounds among American students studying Chinese in China and tentative suggestions for solving the problems. (Zai zhongguo liuxue de meiguo xuesheng yin shehui wenhua beijing de chayi er chansheng de yixie wenti ji jiejue de chubu jianyi). In the First International Symposium of Chinese Teaching (Di yi jie guoji hanyu jiaoxue taolun hui) (Ed.), *Selected papers of the First International Symposium of Chinese Teaching. (Di yi jie guoji hanyu*

jiaoxue taolun hui lunwen xuan). Beijing: Beijing Languages Institute. Publishing House. (pp. 543-553).

Yan, X. (1998). *An examination of foreign language classroom anxiety: Its sources and effects in a college English program in China.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin.

Yang, N. D. (1992). *Second language learners' beliefs about language learning and their use of learning strategies: A study of college students of English in Taiwan.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.

Yearbook of Chinese Education 1949-1981 (1984). (Zhongguo jiaoyu nianjian) China Encyclopaedia Publishing House (Zhongguo Dai Baike Quanshu Chubanshe) (Ed). (pp. 273-292). Beijing: China Encyclopaedia Publishing House.

Yearbook of Chinese Education (1994). (Zhongguo jiaoyu nianjian) China Encyclopaedia Publishing House (Zhongguo Dai Baike Quanshu Chubanshe) (Ed). (pp. 147-209). Beijing: China Encyclopaedia Publishing House.

Yearbook of Chinese Education (2000). (Zhongguo jiaoyu nianjian) China Encyclopaedia Publishing House (Zhongguo Dai Baike Quanshu Chubanshe) (Ed). (pp. 307-320). Beijing: China Encyclopaedia Publishing
House.

Young, D. J. (1990). An investigation of students' perspectives on anxiety end speaking. *Foreign Language Annals, 23,* 539-553.

Young, D. J. (1986). The relationship between anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency ratings. *Foreign Language Annnals. 12,* 449-448

Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *Modern Language Journal, 75 (4),* 426439.

Young, D. J. (1992). Language anxiety from the foreign language specialist's perspective: Interactive with Krashen, Omaggio Hadley, Terrel, and Rardin. *Foreign Language Annals, 25 (2),* 157-172.

Yu, L. M. (2001). Communicative Language Teaching in China: Progress and Resistance. *TESOL Quarterly, 35,* 194-197.

Yuan, B. (1995). Acquisition of based-generated topics by English speaking learners of Chinese. *Language Learning 45*: 567-603.

Zane, N., Sue, S., Hu, L., & Kwon, J. (1991). Asian American Assertion: A social learning analysis of cultural differences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38 (1)*, 63-70.

Zhao, R. (1989). A discourse Analysis of Relative Clauses in Chinese and English: An error in "An Error in Error Analysis". *IDEAL (4),* 105-117.

Zhang, Y. J. (1989). Teaching Chinese to foreign students in history. (Lishi shang de duiwai hanyu jiaoxue) *Language Teaching and Studies (Yuyan jiaoxue yu yanjiu),* 3, 77-95.

Vita

Jiayong Le was born in Shanghai, China on July 17, 1955, the son of Xiutai Le and Yae Lin. After graduating from Shanghai Peng Pu High School, Shanghai, China, he worked as a teacher for Shanghai Peng Pu Elementary School and the company school of Shanghai Light Industrial Machines Company before attending East China Normal University, Shanghai, China. He received his Bachelor of Art in Chinese Literature from East China Normal University in July 1982. He then worked as an instructor of Chinese. His research articles and translated papers were published in several academic journals in China, including Linguistics and Logic, Research in Education, Chinese Education, Exploration, Journal of Youth Studies, Youth Journal and Aesthetic Education. He entered the graduate program at the University of Central Oklahoma from which he received the Master of Education in May 1994. After graduation, he taught Chinese as a lecturer of Chinese at Baruch College, the City University of New York for one year. In January 1996, he entered the doctoral program in Foreign Language Education, the graduate school of the University of Texas at Austin. He was awarded Joseph L. Henderson & Kathryn D. Henderson Scholarship and Texas Public Education Grant.

Permanent address: Apartment 206, Building No. 158
Peng Pu Xin Cun
Shanghai 200435
China

This dissertation was typed by the author.